

THE  
CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW.

Nº LXXIX. APRIL 1895.

---

ART. I.—DIVORCE.

1. *Divorce and Re-marriage: Historical Evidence.* By HOLLINGWORTH TULLY KINGDON, D.D. Cantab., Bishop-Coadjutor of Fredericton. (Montreal and Fredericton: no date.)
2. *Divorce.* Report as received by the Lower House of the Convocation of York. (Helmsley, York, and London: no date.)
3. *The History of Marriage, Jewish and Christian, in relation to Divorce and certain Prohibited Degrees.* By HERBERT MORTIMER LUCKOCK, D.D., Dean of Lichfield. (London, 1894.)
4. *Holy Matrimony: A Treatise on the Divine Laws of Marriage.* By OSCAR D. WATKINS, M.A., a Senior Chaplain on her Majesty's Bengal Establishment. (London, 1895.)
5. *Marriage and Divorce in the United States: as they are and as they ought to be.* By D. CONVERS, S.S.J.E., Assistant at St. Clement's Church, Philadelphia. (Philadelphia, 1889.)
6. *Notes upon some Points in Origen's Commentary on St. Matthew*, xix. 3-11. By H. W. REYNOLDS. (Cambridge, 1894.)
7. *Origen and the York Report on Divorce; being Notes upon some Points in Origen's Commentary on St. Matthew*, xix. 3-11. By the Rev. H. W. REYNOLDS, Christ's College, Cambridge; Vicar of Christ Church, Bolton. (Cambridge, 1895.) (Revised edition of No. 6.)
8. *A Brief Examination of the York Report on Divorce.* By the Rev. H. W. REYNOLDS, Christ's College, Cambridge; Vicar of Christ Church, Bolton. (Cambridge, 1895.)

VOL. XL.—NO. LXXIX.

B

370643

9. *Marriage of Innocent Divorcees.* By the Right Hon. LORD GRIMTHORPE. *The Nineteenth Century*, February. (London, 1895.)

THE above list is a sufficient sign that the present is an appropriate opportunity for the examination of the painful but highly important question of Divorce. The subject is one which, in the existing state of law in England and foreign countries, thoughtful men who have interest and care for individual and social purity can never put very far out of mind, and just now it has been pushed into special prominence by the publication of the 'Report' which has been 'received by the Lower House of the Convocation of York' and the controversy which has ensued.

I. In such an inquiry as we have in view, mindful of words written in 1857 by the revered John Keble,<sup>1</sup> we naturally begin by asking what is the present law of the Church in England. For those who regard the branch of the Catholic Church in this country as a spiritual body, possessing as part of her inheritance powers of legislation which her members are bound to respect, there can be no doubt as to the answer. Such doubt might arise if she were the creation of the State, or if the decisions of the Crown or of Parliament in spiritual matters had any binding force upon her without her own legislative enactment, or if marriage were a special case which, 'though of an ecclesiastical nature,' should be outside the control of the Church herself.<sup>2</sup> But for those who are prepared to affirm that the control of Christian marriage, as based upon theological truth and necessarily connected with morals, was committed by Christ to His Church, and that the administration of it is part of the responsibility of the Church in any country, the answer

<sup>1</sup> Keble, *An Argument for not proceeding immediately to repeal the laws which treat the nuptial bond as indissoluble*, p. 1.

<sup>2</sup> This is Lord Grimthorpe's view. He says: 'I had better state here, what everybody knows who ever read a law-book or looks into Phillimore's *Ecclesiastical Law* (1958-9), that one of the greatest Lord Chancellors and Chief Justices, Lord Hardwicke, and other great judges have declared "there are some things of an ecclesiastical nature which no canon can touch," and marriage was one of them' (p. 327). We do not dispute the general truth of this statement of the opinion of 'Lord Hardwicke and other great judges'; but, as a matter of fact, *nobody* who 'looks into Phillimore's *Ecclesiastical Law* (1958-9)' will find it there. It is instructive to compare Lord Grimthorpe's view of 'the great Act 25 Henry VIII., "for the submission of the clergy,"' with Dixon, *History of the Church of England from the Abolition of the Roman Jurisdiction*, vol. i. pp. 106-111, 189-194; Perry, *History of the English Church*, vol. ii. pp. 78, 82-3, 87-8.

is c  
Pra  
ma  
ma  
som  
per  
ign  
to c  
to r  
bett  
tion  
no  
mig  
of t

can  
be  
The  
from  
both  
ther  
The

a tho  
the a  
chast  
life,  
obse  
be p  
given  
they  
prohi

I  
Cent  
phra  
and  
not t  
the c  
vincu  
pret  
Cano  
decla  
no 'c  
C  
of E



is clear. That the Marriage Service in the Book of Common Prayer does not contemplate the possibility of the bond of marriage terminating as long as both the persons who are married live may perhaps have been pressed too strongly by some writers. If the Prayer Book stood by itself, it might perhaps be argued that the solemn words of the Service are ignoring a contingency which, among Christians, ought never to occur. Such an interpretation would indeed be difficult to reconcile with the marked emphasis on the phrases 'for better for worse,' 'till death us do part,' and on the declaration of the Priest, 'Those whom God hath joined together let no man put asunder;' but, as we have said, we think it might possibly be tenable if we had no light on the meaning of the Prayer Book from any other source.

Further light removes any possible ground of doubt. The canons of 1603, besides their other uses, may on this point be rightly taken as showing what the Prayer Book means. They decisively teach that in no case of a marriage valid from the first does the bond of marriage cease to exist while both the parties live, and that in no such case may either of them contract a fresh 'marriage' in the lifetime of the other. The words of Canon 107 are:

'In all sentences pronounced only for divorce and separation *a thoro et mensa*, there shall be a caution and restraint inserted in the act of the said sentence, That the parties so separated shall live chastely and continently; neither shall they, during each other's life, contract marriage with any other person. And, for the better observation of this last clause, the said sentence of divorce shall not be pronounced until the party or parties requiring the same have given good and sufficient caution and security into the court, that they will not any way break or transgress the said restraint or prohibition.'

In an enigmatical sentence in his article in *The Nineteenth Century* (p. 328) Lord Grimthorpe appears to imply that the phrase in this canon, 'sentences pronounced only for divorce and separation *a thoro et mensa*,' denotes that the obligation not to contract a fresh 'marriage' was not meant to apply in the case of the 'complete or irrevocable divorce' known as a *vinculo*. A reference to Canon 106 shows that such an interpretation cannot be maintained, that the distinction of Canon 107 is between a 'divorce *a thoro et mensa*' and a declaration 'for annulling of pretended matrimony,' and that no 'divorce *a vinculo*' is regarded as possible.

On a practical point of this kind the traditional opinions of English Divines are valuable indications of the meaning of

the Prayer Book. If further proof were needed that a second 'marriage' of either party of a valid marriage in the lifetime of the other is regarded as being under any circumstances impossible, it might be found in a consensus of writers. While it may be regretted that more pains were not taken in the chapter in the Report of the York Committee on 'the mind of the Church of England' (pp. 82-90), and that there was not a much more careful treatment of several writers, notably Bishop Jeremy Taylor,<sup>1</sup> the argument of the chapter will bear investigation and hold good. On the other hand, not one of the three famous instances of great English divines consenting to divorce *a vinculo* and subsequent 'marriage' can be rightly used in an opposite direction. It is true that Bishop Andrewes was one of seven members of the commission of 1613 who voted in favour of the dissolution of the marriage of the Earl and Countess of Essex. But, in the first place, this was a 'decree of nullity' of a marriage said to have been always void because of 'latens et incurabile impedimentum,' not the dissolution of a valid marriage.<sup>2</sup> And, secondly, Bishop Andrewes himself in his careful investigation of the question declares that there cannot be a second marriage after sentence of divorce in the lifetime of the other party.<sup>3</sup> It is true, also, that Archbishop Laud, when he was thirty-two years old, 'married' the divorced wife of Lord Rich to the Earl of Devon. But the Archbishop deeply repented of what his patron the Earl of Devon had persuaded him to do. He put down in his diary on the day of

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Reynolds (*Brief Examination*, pp. 10-11) is right in saying that the passage quoted in the Report from *The Marriage Ring* refers to the union between Christ and the Church. Only inferences from it, therefore, not the words themselves, apply to marriage. We cannot, however, agree with Mr. Reynolds that Bishop Taylor is really 'misrepresented' in the Report. The words 'dissolved and broken,' 'an eternal separation of society and friendship,' in the passage he quotes from part ii. of *The Marriage Ring*, do not appear to mean more than such a separation as does not allow of a fresh 'marriage,' and this view of them is supported by a consideration of the whole lengthy discussion whether a wife may continue to live with a husband of whose adultery she knows in *Ductor Dubitantium*, Book I. chap. v. rule 8, §§ 6-18. In this discussion some sentences in §§ 13 and 15 must be considered in connexion with the theory of marriage underlying the whole treatment.

<sup>2</sup> Ottery, *Lancelot Andrewes*, pp. 72-5. Dean Church wrote of the 'surprise and disappointment' it is 'to find Andrewes one of the majority in pronouncing for a divorce in the shameful Essex case.' See *Masters in English Theology*, p. 69.

<sup>3</sup> Andrewes, *A Discourse against Second Marriage after sentence of divorce with a former match, the party then living*. (*Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology*, Andrewes' Minor Works, p. 106.)

the 'marriage' the words, 'My cross about the Earl of Devon's marriage.'<sup>1</sup> He composed a prayer for the forgiveness of the sin which he had committed in celebrating it, in which the following passage occurs :

'Behold I have become a reproach to thy Name by serving my ambition and the sins of others. Moreover, though I did it by the persuasion of other men, yet my conscience upbraided me. . . . Let not this marriage be a divorce of my soul from thy love. How much better had it been if, mindful of this day,<sup>2</sup> I had suffered martyrdom with the first of thy martyrs !'<sup>3</sup>

Yearly he kept the anniversary of the day as a 'fast, in penitential remembrance of his error.'<sup>4</sup> It is true, again, that in 1670 Bishop Cosin both spoke and voted in favour of the bill to dissolve the marriage of Lord Rosse. But when his own record of his speech is examined, it is found that the only reply which he has to the argument that the bill, if passed, would be contrary to the Church of England, is that if it obtains 'the assent of the king, lords, and commons,' it becomes one of 'the laws of this kingdom,' and that 'the Church of England is within the kingdom of England.'<sup>5</sup> Moreover, Cosin himself wrote down among 'impediments of marriage' 'sentence of divorce from a party yet living.'<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See Le Bas, *Life of Archbishop Laud*, p. 11.

<sup>2</sup> December 26 (St. Stephen's Day), 1605.

<sup>3</sup> Laud, 'Private Devotions' in the *Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology*, Laud's Works, vol. iii. p. 81 : 'Scandalum ecce factus sum Nomini Tuo, dum ambitioni meæ et aliorum peccatis servio. Quin et hoc, licet aliorum suasu, oblatrante tamen conscientia perpetravi. . . . Nec hoc conjugium sit animæ meæ divortium a sinu Tuo. O quanto satius fuisset, si vel hujus diei satis memor, martyrium cum proto-martyre Tuo potius perperuss essem !'

<sup>4</sup> See Le Bas, *Life of Archbishop Laud*, p. 11. In this case the divorce had taken place because of the adultery of Lady Rich with the Earl of Devon. There is no reason to suppose that Laud would not have regarded the subsequent 'marriage' as a sin if the adultery had been on the part of Lord Rich. There are some interesting comments on Laud's action in Mr. Hutton's recently published work : 'Pity for the unhappy woman, . . . the knowledge that there had been what might serve as a pre-contract *in foro conscientie*, as Heylin says, though not *in foro judicii*, and the support of some divines of eminence, these may well have moved him. He was a young man, and his bitterest critics, if they cannot forgive him, may well remember that he could never forgive himself. . . . Among the State Papers of James I. lies the "Censure of the Earl of Devonshire's tract touching marriage and divorce, by William Laud." . . . "The authority of the canon law—true," he comments, "to putting away his wife ; but neither silent nor unexpressed to marry again." Hutton, *William Laud*, pp. 8-9.

<sup>5</sup> See *Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology*, Cosin's Works, vol. iv. p. 501.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* vol. v. p. 522, note u.

It has sometimes been suggested that the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum* represents the mind of the Church of England, and therefore indicates the lawfulness of the 'marriage' of a divorced person. Such an argument is not worth serious consideration. When this work was published in 1571 it was ignored by the Church. A resolution brought forward in the House of Commons to give it legal sanction was not passed. Common consent let the book die a natural death. So temperate a writer as Canon Perry has said of it:

'Had it been accepted by the Church, it would have served more than anything else to sever the reformed Church of England from the Church of the past. It contained many most objectionable laws.'<sup>1</sup>

The existing law of the Church of England, then, as stated in the Prayer Book in the natural sense of the words of the Marriage Service, as indicated in the canons of 1603, and as illustrated by the traditional teaching of representative divines, is that the bond of Christian marriage is indissoluble, and that if married persons are separated, even for adultery, neither party may contract a fresh 'marriage' in the lifetime of the other.

II. The Church in England was no new body in the sixteenth century. She inherited, with her episcopal succession and her valid sacraments, the faith and laws of the Catholic Church. In considering what law of marriage it was that she thus received, it will be convenient to confine our attention, in the first instance, to the laws on the subject which existed in England itself. There is a brief statement of part of the evidence in the Report of the York Committee (pp. 46-7), a fuller treatment in Dean Luckock's *History of Marriage* (pp. 164-176), and a very careful and useful discussion in Mr. Watkins' *Holy Matrimony* (pp. 394-426). The materials for investigating the question are within easy reach of students in the invaluable collections in Haddan and Stubbs' *Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents* and Johnson's *Laws and Canons of the Church of England*.

Three British Bishops assented to the decrees of the Council of Arles in the year 314,<sup>2</sup> but, in the absence of any

<sup>1</sup> Perry, *History of the English Church*, vol. ii. p. 297. There is force in the remark: 'The chief value of the Apocryphal document, the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*, is that it distinctly shows what the Church deliberately refused to adopt in the sixteenth century: nay more, what Parliament also refused to consider in 1571.' See Kingdon, *Divorce and Re-marriage*, p. 90.

<sup>2</sup> See the list in Hardouin, *Concilia*, i. 267. The names of the British Bishops are given also in Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents*, i. 7.

evidence as to their relation to Church opinion in Britain, it may be well to put aside for the present any consideration of the meaning of the famous canon which they must then have affirmed. The canons of Adamnan, Abbot of Iona from 679 to 704,<sup>1</sup> and the synod the heading of which bears the names of Patrick, Auxilius, and Isserninus,<sup>2</sup> but which is perhaps best assigned to a time a little later than 700,<sup>3</sup> interesting as they are as marking belief in two out of the great streams which combined to make up English Christianity, are less expressly connected with the history of our own branch of the Church than the evidence we are about to consider. And the contention that since St. Augustine did not seek advice from St. Gregory the Great on the question of divorce, while he did ask for decisions on other questions about marriage,<sup>4</sup> the rule of the British Church was therefore the same as that existing elsewhere in the West, is an argument of a type which can only be used with much confidence when there is a very full knowledge of surrounding circumstances.

The 'Laws of the Northumbrian Priests,'<sup>5</sup> the 'Penitential of Archbishop Dunstan,'<sup>6</sup> the canons of the Council of

<sup>1</sup> The sixteenth canon lays down that the husband of an unfaithful wife 'is not to take another while she is alive' ('De meretrice conjugis sic idem interpretatus est, quia meretrix erit decusso proprii mariti iugo et secundi mariti inito vel tertii, cujus maritus illa vivente alteram non suscipiet, quia nescimus illam auctoritatem, quam legimus in quæstionibus Romanorum, utrum idoneis an falsis testibus ornatam fuisse'). This highly interesting canon is quoted by Mr. Watkins (p. 398) from *Wasserschleben, Bussordnungen der abendländischen Kirche*, p. 117.

<sup>2</sup> This synod merely treats of the general obligation of the marriage tie. The nineteenth canon says: 'A Christian woman, who has accepted a man in honourable marriage, and has afterwards departed from her first husband and joined herself in adultery: she who has done this is to be excommunicated' ('Mulier Christiana, quæ acciperit virum honestis nuptiis, et postmodum discesserit a primo, et junxerit se adulterio: quæ hæc fecit, excommunis sit'). See Haddan and Stubbs, ii. 329.

<sup>3</sup> 'The first years of the eighth century are the earliest possible date that can be assigned to the collection as a whole.' Haddan and Stubbs, ii. 331.

<sup>4</sup> St. Greg. Magn. *Ep.* xi. 64; cf. xiv. 16, 17.

<sup>5</sup> Section 54 says: 'If any man dismiss his lawful wife while she is living and marry another, let him want God's mercy unless he make satisfaction for it; but let every one retain his lawful wife so long as she lives, unless they both choose to be separated by the Bishop's consent and are willing to preserve their chastity for the future.' See Johnson, *English Canons*, part i. p. 381 (Baron's edition).

<sup>6</sup> Section 27 says: 'He that relinquisheth his wife and taketh another woman breaketh wedlock. Let none of those rights which belong to Christians be allowed him either during life or at his death, nor let him be buried with Christian men.' See Johnson, *ibid.* p. 433.

Eanham,<sup>1</sup> the Ecclesiastical Laws of King Cnut,<sup>2</sup> do not expressly mention cases where a divorce has taken place because of adultery, but it is difficult to suppose that no exception would have been made to their emphatic declarations of the sin of the 'marriage' of a divorced person if it had been held that under any circumstances such an act could take place. A like consideration applies to the interesting document entitled 'Judicium Clementis,'<sup>3</sup>

We are on still firmer ground when we reach the Council of Hertford of 673 and the testimony of the Venerable Bede. The tenth canon of the Council reads:

'Let no man commit incest; let no man leave his own wife except, as the holy Gospel teaches, for the cause of fornication. But if any have expelled his own wife, united to him in lawful wedlock, if he will to be rightly a Christian, he must not be joined to any other, but must so abide or be reconciled to his own wife.'<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Section 8 contains the following: 'Never let it be that a Christian marry . . . one that is divorced. Nor let him who desires to observe God's law aright and to guard himself against hell-fire have more wives than one; but continue with her only so long as she lives.' See Johnson, *ibid.* pp. 484-5.

<sup>2</sup> Section 7 contains the following: 'We enjoin and charge and command, in God's name, that no Christian man do ever take a wife of his own kin within the sixth degree of relation . . . nor a divorced woman. . . . Let no man have more than one wife, and let her be a wedded wife, and let him remain with her only, so long as she lives, if he will rightly observe God's will and secure his soul against hell flames.' See Johnson, *ibid.* p. 506.

<sup>3</sup> Section 14: 'If any man send away his lawful wife and marry another, he is to be excommunicated by Christians, even if the first wife consent' ('Si quis uxorem legitimam dimittit et aliam ducit, excommunicatur a Christianis, etiamsi illa prior uxor consentiat'). Section 15: 'It is not lawful for separation to take place in the case of a lawful marriage unless there is the consent of both, so that they may remain unmarried' ('Non licet legitimo conjugio separari, nisi amborum consensus fuerit, ut innupti maneant'). See Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 227. The writer of these canons is thought by some to have been Willibrord, *ibid.* 226. The nineteenth section allows the husband of a wife who has been taken captive to marry another woman.

<sup>4</sup> 'Pro conjugiiis, ut nulli liceat nisi legitimum habere connubium. Nullus incestum faciat: nullus conjugem propriam, nisi, ut sanctum evangelium docet, fornicationis causa relinquit. Quod si quisquam propriam expulerit conjugem legitimo sibi matrimonio conjunctam, si Christianus esse recte voluerit, nulli alteri copuletur; sed ita permaneat, aut propriæ reconcilietur conjugii.' See Hardouin, *Concilia*, iii. 1017-8: Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 120-1. The history and canons of the Council are given in Bede, *Hist. Eccl.* iv. 5. We are unable to accept the interpretation suggested by Dr. Pusey that the latter half of the canon means: 'But if any do leave his own wife except for the cause of fornication, at least let him not take another;' see his note O on Tertullian in the Oxford *Library of the Fathers*, p. 446. This interpreta-



This Council, then, at which 'all the Bishops of the Anglo-Saxon Church then living, except Wini, the simoniacal Bishop of London, were present either in person or by deputy,'<sup>1</sup> while considering cases of offences against the marriage law, expressly declared the indissoluble character of the marriage bond. The Venerable Bede, with no less clearness, testified to the impossibility of the contraction of a second 'marriage' as long as both parties of the first marriage remained alive.

'What God has joined together by making one flesh of man and woman, this man cannot divide, only perchance God alone. Man divides when because of the desire for a second wife he sends away the first. God who also made the union divides when from consent for the sake of serving God because the time is short we so have wives as if we had none. . . . There is then only one carnal cause, fornication : one that is spiritual, the fear of God so that a wife be sent away as many are recorded to have done for the sake of religion. But there is no cause written in the law of God by which, while she lives who has been left, another may be married.'<sup>2</sup>

It may be asked whether there is no evidence on the other side. And we cannot say that we think the presenters of the Report of the York Committee have dealt fairly, either with the Convocation to which it was addressed or to any who may read it in its published form, in their silence about the 'Penitential of Archbishop Theodore,' the 'Excerptions' and 'Dialogue of Egbert,' the 'Laws of Howel the Good,' and the 'second synod of St. Patrick.' There are good reasons for thinking, as we hope to be able to show, that the tenth canon of the Council of Hertford and the words of Bede rightly represent the law of the Church in England, but a statement which aims at justice ought, at least, to give the opportunity for a full and careful consideration of the documents we have mentioned last.

tion would imply that a person who was disobeying the first part of the canon could 'be rightly a Christian'

<sup>1</sup> Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 121, note b.

<sup>2</sup> Bede, *In Marc. Evang.* cap. x. : 'Quæ Deus conjunxit, unam faciendo carnem viri et feminae, hæc homo non potest separare, nisi forsitan solus Deus. Homo separat, quando propter desiderium secundæ uxoris primam dimittit. Deus separat qui et conjunxerat, quando ex consensu propter servitutem Dei, eo quod tempus in arcto sit, sic habemus uxores quasi non habentes. . . . In Matthæo scriptum plenius est "Quicumque dimiserit uxorem suam nisi ob fornicationem et aliam duxerit, mœchatur." Una ergo solummodo causa est carnalis, fornicatio ; una spiritalis, timor Dei, ut uxor dimittatur, sicut multi religionis causa fecisse leguntur. Nulla autem causa est Dei lege præscripta, ut vivente ea quæ relicta est, alia ducatur.' This comment is based upon St. Jerome, *In Matt. Evang.* (xix. 6).



The 'Penitential of Archbishop Theodore' is referred to by Bishop Kingdon (pp. 84-5) and Dean Luckock (pp. 165-6), and treated with great care and ability by Mr. Watkins (pp. 413-9). One of the provisions of the second book is as follows:

'If a man's wife have committed fornication, it is lawful for him to put her away and take another: that is, if a man have put away his wife because of fornication, if she is his first wife, it is lawful for him to take another wife; she, moreover, if she is willing to do penance for her sins, may take another husband after five years.'<sup>1</sup>

The history of the Penitential is obscure, and on the grounds that the canon we have quoted is out of harmony with the assertion of the general principle of the indissolubility of marriage in the first book,<sup>2</sup> and that Theodore presided at the Council of Hertford which, as we have seen, declared that one who wished 'to be rightly a Christian' 'must not be joined to any other' in the lifetime of his wife, Dean Luckock (pp. 166-7) is of opinion that the 'gravest suspicions' may be entertained about its genuineness. It is perhaps a better supported view that the canon is really Theodore's, and that it is due to the influence exercised upon him by laxity in the East. This theory is advocated with skill and knowledge by Mr. Watkins (pp. 417-8), and it is supported by the conclusions expressed about the Penitential in the elaborate discussion in Haddan and Stubbs' great work.<sup>3</sup> Whatever may be

<sup>1</sup> *Pœnit. Theod.* II. xii. 5: 'Si cujus uxor fornicata fuerit, licet dimittere eam et aliam accipere; hoc est, si vir dimiserit uxorem suam propter fornicationem, si prima fuerit, licitum est ut aliam accipiat uxorem; illa vero, si voluerit pœnitere peccata sua, post v. annos alium virum accipiat.' See Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 199.

<sup>2</sup> *Pœnit. Theod.* I. xiv. 8: 'He who has put away his wife and united himself to another must do penance for seven years with tribulation or for fifteen years with lighter discipline' ('Qui dimiserit uxorem suam, alteri conjungens se, VII. annos cum tribulatione pœniteat, vel XV. levius'). See Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 188.

<sup>3</sup> 'It claims for itself the character of an original treatise . . . it contains, with very significant exceptions, and those easily accounted for, every penitential sentence ascribed in the most ancient and independent collections to Theodore; and it contains them in a systematic form and arrangement, which confirm its claim to originality. But though drawn up under the eye and published with the authority of Theodore, it is not, in the modern view, a direct work of the great Archbishop. According to the preface, it is a collection of answers given by him to persons questioning him . . . most of them received by a priest named Eoda, "of blessed memory," from Theodore himself, and edited by a person who gives himself the title of "Discipulus Umbrensius." . . . Theodore's answers had been illustrated by Eoda. . . by a comparison with a similar *libellus* of Scottish origin. . . . There is nothing to make it improbable that it was drawn up with the sanction of Theodore himself, or under

the exact truth as to the history of the Penitential, it is a significant fact that any laxity there may have been in Theodore of Tarsus himself failed to affect the decisions of the representative Council of Hertford of which he was the president. If his opinion really was that a man who had divorced his wife 'because of fornication' might take another woman, and that the divorced wife might take another man, the force of the canon of the Council of Hertford as an argument that the teaching of the Church in England at that time included the assertion of the indissoluble character of the marriage bond is greatly increased. As Mr. Watkins justly observes, the expression of the stricter view

'in the acts of the Council may be taken as evidence that the Church of England at that time was not in the least prepared to forego her traditions in the matter, even in deference to the convictions of the greatest archbishop who had, up to that time, filled the primatial chair' (p. 414).

The 'Excerptions of Egbert,' who was Archbishop of York in the eighth century, while not altogether consistent, afford testimony in support of the indissolubility of marriage, and can only have been claimed on the opposite side through want of care. In the course of Canon 119 it is said :

'Augustine says, "If a woman commit fornication she is to be dismissed ; but another is not to be married while she is alive." Wherever, then, there is fornication, and a just suspicion of fornication, the wife may be freely dismissed.'

The next three canons are :

'120. The African canon. According to the Evangelical discipline, neither let a wife, dismissed from her husband, take another man, the former living ; nor a husband another woman ; but let them so remain, or be reconciled.

'121. Augustin says : "If a woman commit fornication she is to be relinquished, but another must not be taken so long as she lives."

'122. A canon says : "If a woman depart from her husband with a contempt of him, refusing to return and be reconciled to him, he may take another wife after five or seven years with the Bishop's consent, if he cannot contain. But let him do penance for three years, or even so long as he lives, because he is convicted of adultery by the sentence of our Lord."'

his eye ; rather it may be said that the verses found at the end of the treatise, in which Theodore commends himself to the prayers of Bishop Haeddi, make it certain that this was the case.' Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 173 : see the whole discussion on pp. 173-6.

<sup>1</sup> See Johnson, *English Canons*, part i. p. 209. Parts, at any rate, of this collection must be later than the time of Egbert. Johnson says of

It is unnecessary to comment at length on the extraordinary character of the last canon, which says that a union is to be allowed with the Bishop's consent, for which penance is to be done and which is adulterous. The other three expressly declare that marriage is indissoluble.

The thirteenth question in the 'Dialogue of Egbert' deals with a difficult point arising subsequently to a valid marriage. A positive decision is avoided, and the statement made that 'sentence is not to be given in doubtful matters.'<sup>1</sup>

The 'Laws of Howel the Good' were probably composed early in the tenth century. They were agreed to by an assembly of clergy and laity held in the year 928 at Whitland in South Wales. King Howel had already been to Rome, accompanied by three Bishops, in order to obtain advice with a view to the improvement of Welsh law, and a

them: 'The following canons are called the Excerptions of Eggbriht; and I see no room for doubt of his being the first founder of this work; and though great alterations have been made in it, yet they seem to have been made not long after the age of Eggbriht. In truth, this collection looks like a code of canons for the province of York, which the successors of Eggbriht, or others, augmented, curtailed, and transposed at discretion' (*ibid.* p. 181). A different opinion has been expressed by Haddan and Stubbs (*iii.* 415): 'Possibly Egbert had the reputation of having compiled some set of canons or other, and so they' (*i.e.* the transcribers of the MSS. of the Excerptions) 'guessed at these being his. Anyhow, as they stand, they are *not* his. There is nothing original in them; and certainly not sufficient evidence to make it probable that they are even based upon anything which he compiled.'

<sup>1</sup> See Haddan and Stubbs, *iii.* 409: 'XIII. *Interrogatio.* Quod si ex convenientia amborum legitimum dissolvitur conjugium, propter infirmitatem viri vel uxoris, si liceat sano incontinenti secundum inire conubium, infirmo consensum præbente, et promittente sese continentiam in perpetuo servaturum: Vestra Sanctitas quid de hoc judicat? *Responsio.* Nemo contra Evangelium, nemo contra Apostolum sine vindicta facit, idcirco consensum minime præbemus adulteris; onera tamen, quæ sine periculo portari non possunt, nemini inponimus, ea vero, quæ Dei sunt mandata, confidenter indicimus. Quem autem infirmitas implendi præpedit, uno profecto multum reservamus iudicio Dei. Igitur ne forte videamur silentio fovere adulteros, aut diabolus qui decipit adulteros de adulteris exultat, ulterius audi: 'Quod Deus conjunxit, homo non separet.' Et item: 'Qui potest capere, capiat.' Sepe namque temporum permutatione, necessitas legem frangit. Quid enim fecit David, quando esuriit? et tamen sine peccato est. Ergo in ambiguis non est ferenda sententia. Sed consilia necesse est periclitari pro salute aliorum, hac conditione interposita, ut ei qui se continentiae devovit nullo modo concedatur secundas inire nuptias, vivente priore.' 'This work . . . is generally received as genuine, the single doubt thrown upon it by the fact of its variations from the *Excerptiones Egberti* disappearing, as closer examination shows the latter work not to be Egbert's at all' (Haddan and Stubbs, *iii.* 403). Mr. Watkins (pp. 419-420) has an able comment on this 'Responsio.'

subsequent visit in connexion with the laws agreed upon at the assembly confirms the impression that he was in earnest in this work. The form in which we know the laws is not earlier than the thirteenth century and may have been largely altered. As they stand in it, they allow the 'marriage' of a husband or of a wife who has been separated. Such a fact is to be noted, but the general laxity of the regulations is so greatly out of harmony with the principles of Christian legislation that it may be doubted whether they denote anything else than weak concessions of the Church and the State in Wales in the face of immorality which they felt themselves unable to suppress.<sup>1</sup>

The canons known as those of the 'second synod of St. Patrick,' which are probably of somewhat later date, allow a man who has put away his wife 'for the cause of fornication' to 'marry a second wife as if after the death of the former.'<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> An account of the making of the 'Laws of Howel the Good,' and the ecclesiastical portions of the laws themselves are in Haddan and Stubbs, i. 209-83. The regulations of the three codes, the Venedotian, the Dimetian, and the Gwentian, are there printed and translated in parallel columns. The laws 'of women' are on pp. 246-51. They made marriage terminable apparently without any reasons besides the wish of husband and wife, and without restrictions except with regard to pecuniary rights and compensations, and with freedom to both to 'marry' again. Some particulars about the date of the laws are given in Haddan and Stubbs, i. 211: 'In course of time the (seemingly) at first single code became distinguished into three, varying with the three great divisions of Wales, viz. Gwynedd (Venedotia), Dyfed (Dimetia) for Deheubarth, and Gwent (*i.e.* Monmouth, &c.) for Morganwg. . . . Subsequent revisions, from certainly A.D. 1080 to the Statute of Rhuddlan A.D. 1284 (which introduced English law), have also rendered it impossible to separate in the code, according to existing MSS., the exact laws of the original code from later alterations or additions. It must be borne in mind, therefore, that the following extracts are from twelfth and thirteenth century transcripts only, of a document, embodying, no doubt, and modifying documents earlier than its own date (of a little after 900), but itself again, as undoubtedly, largely modified before these transcripts were made.'

<sup>2</sup> See Haddan and Stubbs, ii. 337: 'XXVI. *De meretrice conjugē. Audi Dominum dicentem, "Qui adhæret meretrici, unum corpus efficitur."* Item, "*Adultera lapidetur,*" id est, huic vitio moriatur, ut desinat crescere quæ non desinit mœchari. Item, si adulterata fuerit mulier, nunquid revertitur ad virum suum priorem? Item, "*Non licet viro dimittere uxorem, nisi ob causam fornicationis,*" ac si dicat, ob hanc causam; unde, si ducat alteram velut post mortem prioris, non vetant.' As to the source of these decrees, see *ibid.* p. 333: 'The canons . . . in this (so-called) Second Synod are indisputably Irish; but hardly St. Patrick's. Of this "Second Synod," cc. III., VIII., XIV., XXIII., XXIV., XXV., XXX. occur . . . in the *Cod. Can. Hibern.*, and are there referred in most cases (not to St. Patrick, but) to a Roman Synod as adopted by an Irish one. And can. XXVII. of the list is directly contrary to St. Patrick's own "*Confessio.*"'

It cannot, then, be denied that there are individual instances of lax decisions in England, Wales, and Ireland. There is nothing in them to indicate the existence of a tradition allowing 'marriage' after divorce, and any right method of reasoning shows them to be mere exceptions in violation of the rule of the Church which was expressed at Hertford and by Bede, and implied in other documents to which we have referred, and which was at a later date unquestionably accepted in the acceptance of the marriage provisions of the canon law.<sup>1</sup> Allowing the fullest force to the evidence of which we have been writing, there is every reason to believe that the law of the Church in England since the sixteenth century which declares the indissoluble character of the marriage bond does not differ from the law which before that time had existed in this country continuously from the earliest days of which we have record.

III. At whatever point in her history the Church in England is part of a larger whole. Her appeal cannot end with the consideration of what she herself has done. Inheriting the truth and grace which are the possession of the whole mystical Body of Christ, she inherits also the duty of loyalty to the whole Catholic Church. We have then to inquire whether the assertion by the Church in England of the indissolubility of marriage is in accordance with this duty.

It will be convenient to examine the period from the beginning of the sixth century to the growth of the canon law before going back to earlier times, and to take the West and the East separately.

<sup>1</sup> Instances of these provisions are given by Mr. Watkins (pp. 390-3). It is sufficient in this place, on a point so impossible to dispute, to refer to the 'dictum' in the *Decretum* of Gratian (II. xxxii. 7) which declares that a husband commits adultery if he 'marries' in the lifetime of a wife whom he has put away because of fornication ('His auctoritatibus evidentissime monstratur, quod quicumque causa fornicationis uxorem suam dimiserit, illa vivente aliam ducere non poterit, et, si duxerit, reus adulterii est'). The ordinary Western position since the twelfth century is given by, e.g., Peter Lombard, *Sent.* iv. 31: 'Separatio autem gemina est, corporalis scilicet et sacramentalis. Corporaliter possunt separari causa fornicationis, vel ex communi consensu causa religionis, sive ad tempus sive usque in finem. Sacramentaliter vero separari non possunt dum vivunt, si legitimæ personæ sint. Manet enim vinculum conjugale inter eos, etiamsi alii a se discedentes adhæserint.' St. Thom. Aq., *S. T. Suppl.* lxii. 5: 'Nihil adveniens supra matrimonium potest ipsum dissolvere. Et ideo adulterium non facit quin sit verum matrimonium. "Manet" enim, ut Augustinus dicit, "inter viventes conjugale vinculum, quod nec separatio nec cum aliquo junctio potest auferre." Et ideo non licet uni, altero vivente, ad aliam copulam transire.'

The teaching of the Church in the West in this period is not different from that of the prevalence of which in England we have already written. Again, there are slight and occasional exceptions to the rules ordinarily laid down. In the year 506 the Council of Agde, without making any express statement on the subject, appears to imply that for some causes divorces may be granted and remarriages allowed by the Bishops.<sup>1</sup> The national assembly convened by King Pepin at Verberie in 753, the decrees of which may have met with the acquiescence of the ecclesiastical authorities, allowed a separated husband or wife to 'marry' under circumstances of different kinds.<sup>2</sup> Four years later the Council of Compiègne allowed remarriage, not only in cases where separation had taken place because of leprosy or incestuous adultery, but also if one of the parties had entered a monastery, or if a vassal on leaving his lord had left at the same time the wife

<sup>1</sup> Canon 25: 'Those laymen who by a grievous fault are dissolving, or even have dissolved, the conjugal partnership, and who, without credibly declaring any causes of divorce, are dissolving their marriages for this reason, that they may take to them unlawful or strange connexions, if they have cast away their wives before they have stated the causes of divorce before the Bishops of the Province and before the wives have been judicially condemned, are to be excluded from the communion of the Church and the holy congregation of the people, because they defile their faith and their marriage unions' ('Hi vero seculares qui conjugale consortium culpa graviore dimittunt, vel etiam dimiserunt; et nullas causas discidium probabiliter proponentes, propterea sua matrimonia dimittunt, ut aut illicita, aut aliena præsumant; si antequam apud episcopos comprovinciales discidium causas dixerint, et prius uxores, quam iudicio damnentur, abjecerint; a communione Ecclesiæ, et sancto populi cœtu, pro eo quod fidem et conjugia maculant, excludantur'). See Hardouin, ii. 1001.

<sup>2</sup> The wife might 'marry' because of incestuous adultery on the part of the husband. The husband might 'marry,' if his wife had conspired against his life, or if she refused to go with him when he was obliged to leave his own country. See canons 2: 'Si aliquis cum filiastra sua manet, nec matrem, nec filiam ipsius potest habere; nec ille, nec illa aliis se poterunt conjungere ullo unquam tempore. Attamen uxor ejus, si ita voluerit, si se continere non potest, si posteaquam cognovit quod cum filia sua vir ejus fuit in adulterio, carnale commercium cum eo non habet, nisi voluntate abstinere, potest alio nubere'; 18, 'Qui cum consobrina uxoris suæ manet, sua careat, et nullam aliam habeat: illa mulier quam habuit, faciat quod vult'; 5, 'Si qua mulier mortem viri sui cum aliis hominibus consiliavit, et ipse vir ipsius hominem se defendendo occiderit, et hoc probare potest; ille vir potest ipsam uxorem dimittere, et si voluerit aliam accipiat'; 9, 'Si quis necessitate inevitabili cogente in alium ducatum seu provinciam fugerit . . . ; et uxor ejus, cum valet et potest . . . eum sequi noluerit . . . ille vir ejus . . . si se abstinere non potest, aliam uxorem cum pœnitentia potest accipere.' To canon 18 the words 'Hoc ecclesia non recipit' are added. See Hardouin, iii. 1990-2.



whom his lord gave him.<sup>1</sup> A canon attached to the canons of the Council of Worms of 868 allowed, among other relaxations, the 'marriage' of a woman who had put away her husband because of her discovery of his incestuous adultery prior to his marriage with her.<sup>2</sup> The Council of Soissons of 744,<sup>3</sup> and a canon passed by a Roman synod in 826 and ratified by another Roman synod in 853,<sup>4</sup> used language which is difficult to interpret, but which may have

<sup>1</sup> Canons 16 (leprosy); 8, 14, 15 (incestuous adultery); 13 (monastic vow); 6, 'Homo francus accepit beneficium de seniore suo, et duxit secum suum vassallum; et postea fuit ibi mortuus ipse senior, et dimisit ibi ipsum vassallum: et post hoc accepit alius homo ipsum beneficium; et pro hoc ut melius potuisset habere illum vassallum, dedit ei mulierem de ipso beneficio, et habuit ipsam aliquo tempore: et dimissa illa reversus est ad parentes senioris sui mortui, et accepit ibi uxorem, et modo habet eam. Diffinitum est, quod illam quam postea accepit ipsam habeat.' See Hardouin, iii. 2005-6.

<sup>2</sup> Canon 63: 'Si quis cum matre et filia in adulterio mansit, nesciente matre, quod cum filia mansisset: similiter et filia nescia, quod cum matre mansisset: et postea ille vir si acceperit mulierem, dimittat eam, et usque in diem mortis suæ non habeat uxorem. Et illa mulier, quam reliquerit, accipiat virum: et illa mater et filia, cum quibus in adulterio mansit, ambabus nescientibus, quod cum matre et filia mansisset, habeant viros. Nam in notitiam illarum si venerit hoc scelus, dimittant maritos, et agant poenitentiam: et illarum mariti et illi posteriores, accipiant mulieres. Similiter et de duabus sororibus, qui cum una in adulterio mansit, et aliam in publico accepit, non habeat mulierem usque ad mortem. Et illæ duæ sorores nescientes, accipiant viros: et si in notitiam eis venerit forma superior servetur.' See Hardouin, v. 745.

<sup>3</sup> Canon 9: 'We ordain that . . . no one take the wife of another while her husband is living, and that no woman take another husband while her own is living; because a husband ought not to send away his wife except for the cause of discovered fornication' ('Constituimus, ut . . . nec marito vivente suam mulierem alius accipiat, nec mulier vivente suo viro alium accipiat: quia maritus mulierem suam non debet dimittere, excepto causa fornicationis deprehensæ'). See Hardouin, iii. 1934. Bishop Kingdon comments on this canon that it 'seems doubtful, for though the dismissal for adultery is seemingly acknowledged, the remarriage is forbidden unconditionally. It probably intends to forbid remarriage, though separation is allowed' (p. 34). The extraordinary character of the Latin of the canon will be observed. King Pepin, after the Council, referred the question of remarriage after separation to Pope Zacharias, who replied that both parties were to remain unmarried or be reconciled to each other. See his *Epistola* vii. 12, in Hardouin, iii. 1903.

<sup>4</sup> Canon 36: 'Let no one be allowed, except for the cause of fornication, to leave the wife who is joined to him and then unite with another: otherwise it is expedient that the transgressor be united in his former wedlock' ('Nulli liceat excepta causa fornicationis adhibitam uxorem relinquere, et deinde aliam copulare: alioquin transgressorem priori convenit sociari conjugio'). See Hardouin, v. 69. Here, again, the doubt is whether 'excepta causa fornicationis' is to be taken with 'aliam copulare' as well as with 'uxorem relinquere.'

mean  
wh  
'mar  
obvi  
law;  
was  
shine  
most  
Chur  
canon  
case  
those  
bilit  
and l

O  
clear  
neith  
comp  
to co  
live.

<sup>1</sup> B  
Arian  
Domin  
regis, i  
terram  
deprec  
ejus D  
See H  
<sup>2</sup> C  
of forn  
adulter  
in the s  
away h  
it is all  
that it i  
causa j  
uxorem  
evangel  
virum u  
in conj  
gitur.'

<sup>3</sup> As  
Archbis  
521-38.  
it conta  
And a  
est, ut n  
conjunc  
a conj  
nuptial  
VOL.



meant that in a separation because of adultery the person who had not committed adultery was free to contract a fresh 'marriage.' Of these instances the decision at Agde is obviously a concession weakly made by the Church to secular law; <sup>1</sup> the canons of Compiègne and of Verberie, if the latter was accepted by the Church, show the influence of 'the sunshine of secular favour' which Mr. Watkins regards as 'the most potent of all instruments for the undermining of the Church's loyalty' (p. 389); the Council of Worms, if the canon referred to belongs to that Council, is legislating for a case so horrible that it may easily have led into inconsistency those who would ordinarily have maintained the indissolubility of marriage; the meaning of the decisions at Soissons and Rome is not uncertain.

On the other hand, there is evidence of the greatest clearness that by the ordinary law of the Western Church neither party in a Christian marriage once validly and completely contracted was under any circumstances free to contract another marriage so long as the other should live. The decrees of the Councils of Friuli <sup>2</sup> and Toul, <sup>3</sup> of

<sup>1</sup> But too much should not be based on the Council speaking of the Arian Alaric II. in the following terms in the *præfatio*: 'Cum in nomine Domini, ex permissu domini nostri gloriosissimi, magnificentissimique regis, in civitate Agathensi sancta synodus convenisset, ibique flexis in terram genibus, pro regno ejus, pro longævitate, pro populo Dominum deprecaretur: ut, qui nobis congregationis permiserat potestatem, regnum ejus Dominus felicitate extenderet, justitia gubernaret, virtute protegeret.' See Hardouin, ii. 997.

<sup>2</sup> Canon 10: 'Though the bond of marriage be broken for the cause of fornication, a man may not marry another wife as long as the adulteress lives, though she be an adulteress... For although it is read in the sacred pages of the Gospel that the Lord said that a man may send away his wife for the cause of fornication alone, yet it is not read that it is allowed for him to marry another while she lives; there is no doubt that it is in every way forbidden' ('Item placuit ut, resoluta fornicationis causa jugali vinculo, non liceat viro, quamdiu adultera vivit, aliam uxorem ducere, licet sit illa adultera... Nam etsi legatur in sacris evangelicis paginis, sola fornicationis causa dixisse Dominum, dimittere virum uxorem suam: non tamen legitur concessisse aliam, vivente illa, in conjugio sibi sociare: prohibuisse quidem modis omnibus non ambigitur.' See Hardouin, iv. 359-60. The date of the Council was 791 A.D.

<sup>3</sup> As shown in the letter written in 860 at the wish of the Council by Archbishop Hincmar of Rheims. The letter is printed in Hardouin, v. 521-38. The main subject of it is a different, though cognate, point, but it contains very express statements of the indissolubility of marriage. And a comparison of the passage 'Hujus procul dubio sacramenti res est, ut mas et femina connubio copulati, quamdiu vivant, inseparabiliter conjuncti perseverent: nec liceat, excepta causa fornicationis, conjugem a conjugate dirimi' (*ibid.* 525-6) with, *e.g.*, the passages 'Legaliter et nuptialiter copulati excepta causa fornicationis separari non possunt; et

Nantes<sup>1</sup> and Paris,<sup>2</sup> are instances of numerous decisions which may be found collected and discussed with great clearness and impartiality by Mr. Watkins (pp. 362-394). And if Pope Gregory II.<sup>3</sup> permitted the re-marriage of the husband in the same difficult case which led to hesitation in the 'Dialogue of Egbert,' there is no trace of evidence to throw doubt on the same writer's assertion that this 'concession' 'is perhaps the only instance in the whole long line of Roman pontiffs of a failure to maintain' (p. 377) the indissolubility of the bond of Christian marriage.

The only reasonable inference from the investigation of the Church in the West from the beginning of the sixth century to the growth of the canon law is that the canon law faithfully represented on this point the tradition of the Western Church throughout the period.

causa fornicationis separati, aut permanere innupti, aut mutuo debent reconciliari' (*ibid.* 531); 'Causa autem fornicationis vir aut mulier ab invicem discedentes, propter sacramentum nuptialis conjunctionis, aut innupti quousque alter eorum moriatur manebunt, aut sibi reconciliari studebunt' (*ibid.* 532); 'Vinculum conjugale, legaliter et nuptialiter celebratum, indissolubiliter manet connexum, licet fornicationis causa vel quacunque de causa videatur separatum' (*ibid.* 533), shows the probability of, e.g., the decree of Soissons being rightly interpreted as not sanctioning 'marriage' after divorce.

<sup>1</sup> Canon 12: 'If a man's wife has committed adultery . . . let him send away his wife, if he will, because of fornication. . . . But her husband may not on any account take another wife while she lives' ('Si cujus uxor adulterium perpetravit, . . . dimittat uxorem, si voluerit, propter fornicationem. . . . Vir vero ejus illa vivente nullatenus aliam accipiat'). See Hardouin, vi. 459. The date of this Council is uncertain. Sirmond (quoted *ibid.* 462, cf. iii. 985) says that it cannot be so late as 900, and that if anyone likes to refer it to 658, 'liberum esto judicium.' Hefele (*Councils*, iv. 476, English translation) mentions, without expressing his own opinion, that Pagi and Sirmond refer the canons to 658.

<sup>2</sup> *I.e.* the great Council held at Paris in 829 A.D. See iii. 2 (Hardouin, iv. 1353): 'A wife is not to be sent away except for the cause of fornication, as the Lord says, but is rather to be borne. And those who marry other wives when their own have been sent away for the cause of fornication are to be marked as adulterers by the judgment of the Lord' ('Et quod nisi causa fornicationis, ut Dominus ait, non sit uxor dimittenda, sed potius sustinenda. Et quod hi, qui causa fornicationis dimissis uxoris suis alias ducunt, Domini sententia adulteri esse notentur'). Compare especially Hertford (673 A.D.), canon 10 (Hardouin, iii. 1017-8); Aix-la-Chapelle *Capitulare* (789 A.D.), cap. 43 (*ibid.* iv. 836); Worms (829 A.D.), repeating the decisions at Paris (*ibid.* iv. 1362); Tribur (895 A.D.), canon 46 (*ibid.* vi. 453-4); Troli (909 A.D.), cap. 8 (*ibid.* vi. 526).

<sup>3</sup> *Epistola* ii. ad Bonifacium Episcopum, 2 (printed in Hardouin, iii. 1858-9): 'Nam quod proposuisti, quod si mulier infirmitate correpta non valuerit debitum viro reddere, quid ejus faciat jugalis? Bonum esset si sic permaneret, ut abstinentiae vacaret. Sed quia hoc magnorum est, ille qui se non poterit continere, nubat magis; non tamen subsidii opem subtrahat ab illa, quam infirmitas præpediit, et non detestabilis culpa excludit.'

Very different was the history of marriage in the East during the same period. The Church, indeed, never acquiesced in the worst features of the marriage laws of the Eastern Empire. Mr. Watkins points out how, though the prohibitions of Justinian of 'divorce by consent' had been 'largely regarded during the twenty-four years during which they had stood unrepealed,' yet 'in 566 A.D. the lawfulness of divorce by mutual consent was again as fully recognized by the law of the Empire as if Christianity had been unknown in it,' and 'for nearly two hundred years the statute books of the Eastern Empire show no sign of amelioration.' In their earnest battle against this terrible laxity he tells us that 'the responsible teachers of the Eastern Church do not appear to have ever swayed,' and that 'to them it is due that from the end of the ninth century onwards the laws of the states of Eastern Christendom have continued so far at one with the law of Christ that they uniformly prohibit the ancient licence of consensual divorce' (pp. 350, 352). Yet numerous causes for divorce and the lawfulness of 'marriage' after divorce were recognized continuously during this period and are recognized at the present time by the Eastern Church.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> It is difficult to find authority for any more exact statement about the East. The above, however, indicates sufficiently the difference between the East and the West. At the Council of Florence (A.D. 1439), after the decrees had been signed, eleven questions were asked of the Greeks by the Latins. The tenth of these was: 'Why do ye separate marriages, since the Lord said "Whom God hath joined, let not man separate"?' (*Δι' ἣν αἰτίαν χωρίζετε τὰ ἀνδράγυνα, τοῦ κυρίου εἰπόντος· οὗς ὁ Θεὸς ἐξέυθεν, ἄνθρωπος μὴ χωρίζτω*); and this inquiry was one of the two to which Dorotheus, the Metropolitan of Mitylene, was unable to give a satisfactory answer. The Pope then addressed both questions to the Emperor, and the Eastern Bishops answered on his behalf that they did not allow separations without good reason (*τὰ συνοικέσια ἡμῶν οὐκ ἀλόγως χωρίζονται*). See Hardouin, ix. 429-32; cf. Popoff, *History of the Council of Florence*, pp. 158-9, English translation. The Greek canonists of the twelfth century appear to have regarded the legislation of Justinian as rightly to be accepted by the Church. See Bishop Kingdon's book, pp. 96-7. Alexius of Constantinople is quoted by Dean Luckock (pp. 151-2) as allowing 'marriage' in the case of a divorce for adultery only to the person who had not committed adultery. A statement written by the Archbishop of Athens is printed on p. 35 of the York Report, according to which the Bishops 'dissolve spiritually' marriages which have been 'legally dissolved' by 'the Court of First Instance'; 'dissolution of marriage is permitted' for 'further reasons' besides adultery; and 'both parties divorced' may 'contract another marriage by ecclesiastical ceremony,' although 'it is not, strictly speaking, legal' for 'parties who have committed adultery to contract a marriage.' A large number of cases in which divorce and remarriage are allowed by the Church in accordance with the secular law are given by Mr. Watkins, pp. 346-62. On the other hand, the Russian writer

Working back, then, from the present time to the year 500 A.D., we are met by the problem that while the Church in England and the Western Church, of which it forms a part, have steadily maintained the indissoluble character of the marriage bond, Eastern Christians have allowed that, under certain circumstances, the bond ceases to exist. As a matter of hypothesis, there are several possible explanations of this difference. It might be conjectured that the Eastern Church has maintained unaltered the law of the primitive Church, or that the law of the Church always has been as in the canon law of the West, or that at the first the law was different from that of either, and that, while the East has relaxed, the West has tightened.

If the Church of England makes her appeal to the whole Catholic Church, it must be known in which of these differing laws or in what respect in both of them there has been departure from the true law of the Body of Christ.

IV. Between the days of the Apostles and the year 500 A.D. a number of Councils made decisions on the subject we are considering. Among these there is one which, because of its excommunication of husbands who have put away their wives and 'married' other women without any proof of the adultery of the wives, has been thought to allow of remarriage after divorce when there has been adultery.<sup>1</sup> It may be

Macarius says: 'Le Seigneur n'a indiqué qu'un seul cas où il soit permis de rompre le mariage; c'est le cas de l'infidélité ou de la violation du lien conjugal par l'un ou l'autre des époux: "Quiconque renvoie sa femme, si ce n'est en cas d'adultère, et en épouse une autre, commet un adultère" (Mat. xix. 9); "Quiconque aura renvoyé sa femme, si ce n'est en cas d'adultère, la fait devenir adultère" (*ibid.* v. 32). Aussi les décrets de saints conciles et les règles des saints Pères ne marquent-ils que ce seul cas qui permette la dissolution du mariage; ils remarquent néanmoins que, même dans ce cas, le lien des époux peut se maintenir par leur réconciliation et demeurer indissoluble.' See his *Théologie Dogmatique Orthodoxe*, tome ii. pp. 582-3. We do not know the original of this work, but it is understood that the French translation, from which we have quoted, is dependable. In Palmer's *Dissertations on subjects relating to the 'Orthodox' or 'Eastern-Catholic' Communion*, p. 305, differences between the Greek and Russian Churches on the subjects of the degrees of consanguinity and affinity and of mixed marriages are noted, but not with regard to divorce.

<sup>1</sup> Canon 2 of the Council of Vannes (465 A.D.): 'We ordain that those also who have left their own wives, as is said in the Gospel, except for the cause of fornication, and have married others without proof of adultery, are to be withheld from communion in like manner, lest the sins overlooked through our indulgence should invite others to freedom of error' ('Eos quoque, qui relictis uxoribus suis, sicut in Evangelio dicitur, excepta causa fornicationis, sine adulterii probatione alias duxerint, statuimus a communione similiter arcendos: ne per indulgentiam

doubted whether much could rightly be based upon this decree of the Council of Vannes taken merely by itself. Those who have considered the list of the six Bishops who formed the Council will recognize the justice of Mr. Watkins' comment that they were 'dealing chiefly with the lax habits of Christians who availed themselves of the indulgence of the Frankish secular laws' (p. 384), and that their decisions were not unaffected by the customs by which they were surrounded, and will be careful not to infer from the silence of the canon about those 'married' after the divorce of adulterous wives that their action was therefore approved.

On the other hand, the prohibitions of 'marriage' after divorce for adultery are numerous. The Apostolical canon which authoritatively forbids a husband who has put away his wife to 'marry' another<sup>1</sup> does not, it is true, mention this special case. But it is hardly to be supposed that in such a collection of rules no notice would have been made of so important an exception had it been recognized. The Council of Elvira forbids 'marriage' to a woman who has left her husband because of his adultery.<sup>2</sup> The Council of Arles declares that young Christians who have detected the adultery of their wives are prohibited to 'marry.'<sup>3</sup> The famous canon

nostram prætermissa peccata alios ad licentiam erroris invitent'). See Hardouin, ii. 797.

<sup>1</sup> Canon 47: 'If a layman put away his wife and take another or a woman divorced by another, let him be excommunicated' (Εἴ τις λαϊκὸς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ γυναῖκα ἐκβάλλων ἑτέραν λάβῃ, ἢ παρ' ἄλλου ἀπολελυμένην, ἀφοριεῖσθω). See Hardouin, i. 21.

<sup>2</sup> Canon 9: 'A Christian woman who has left an adulterous Christian husband and is marrying another is to be forbidden to marry; if, however, she has married, she is not to receive communion before the death of the man whom she has left, unless mortal sickness compel it' ('Item fidelis femina, quæ adulterum maritum reliquerit fidelem, et alterum ducit, prohibeatur ne ducat; si autem duxerit, non prius accipiat communionem, nisi quem reliquerit prius de sæculo exierit; nisi forte necessitas infirmitatis dare compulerit'). Canon 8 forbids communion even before death to women who have left their husbands without any cause and have been united to others. See Hardouin, i. 251. The date of this Council is variously given: Hardouin, 313 A.D.; Mansi (ii. 22), 309 A.D.; Hefele (i. 137, English translation), 305 A.D.

<sup>3</sup> Canon 10: 'Of those who discover their wives in adultery and are young Christians and are forbidden to marry, it was determined that they be most strongly advised not to take other wives while their own live, though they be adulterous' ('De his qui conjuges suas in adulterio deprehendunt, et iidem sunt adolescentes fideles, et prohibentur nubere, placuit ut in quantum possit consilium eis detur, ne viventibus uxoribus suis, licet adulteris, alias accipiant'). See Hardouin, i. 265. The date of the Council was 314. We cannot say we think Bishop Kingdon's 'that by all means they be counselled' (p. 28) a happy translation of 'ut in quantum possit consilium eis detur.' Hefele's admirable explanation

102 of the African code asserts that either a man or a woman who has been put away must remain separated or be reconciled;<sup>1</sup> and there is no trace that this decision was anywhere interpreted to contemplate an exception to the rule if the separation had been caused by adultery. The collection of canons frequently described as those of the synod of Milevi re-enacted the African canon without alteration.<sup>2</sup> The Council of Angers used language of singular strength in ex-

of the difficult language of this canon is as follows: 'In reference to the ninth canon of Elvira, the Synod of Arles has in view simply the case of a man putting away his adulterous wife; whilst, on the contrary, the Council of Elvira refers to the case of a woman leaving her adulterous husband. In both cases the two Councils alike depart from the existing civil law, by refusing to the innocent party the right of marrying again. But there is the noteworthy difference, that the right of remarrying is forbidden to the woman, under penalty of permanent excommunication (can. 9 of Elvira); while the man is only strongly advised ('in quantum possit consilium iis detur') not to marry again. Even in this case marriage is not allowed, as is shown by the expression 'et prohibetur nubere.' This Synod will not allow that which has been forbidden, but only abstains from imposing ecclesiastical penance. Why is it more considerate to the man? Undoubtedly because the existing civil law gave greater liberty to the husband than to the wife, and did not regard the connexion of a married man with an unmarried woman as adultery.' See Hefele, i. 189-90, English translation. Compare canon 24 in the MS. discovered at Lucca by Mansi: see Mansi, ii. 474; Hefele, i. 196, E.T. Lord Grimthorpe in his singularly silly comment on this Council (p. 334) appears to be under the impression that there is some authority for Petavius' conjectural emendation of the reading suggested in his edition of Epiphanius, *Adv. Hær.* lix. 3 (t. ii. app. p. 255).

<sup>1</sup> 'It was determined that, in accordance with Evangelical and Apostolic discipline, neither a man put away by his wife nor a woman put away by her husband may be united to another; but let them remain so, or be reconciled to each other' ('Placuit, ut secundum evangelicam et apostolicam disciplinam neque dimissus ab uxore, neque dimissa a marito, alteri conjungatur; sed ita maneant, aut sibimet reconcilientur'). See Hardouin, i. 923; cf. Ballerini, *Oper. S. Leonis*, t. iii. p. xcvi.

<sup>2</sup> Canon 17. See Hardouin, i. 1220. This is quoted by Bishop Kingdon (pp. 31, 42) and the York Report (pp. 53, 60) as of the Council of Milevi, about 416 A.D. Dean Luckock (p. 146) takes the same view and adds that 'St. Augustine not only subscribed' the canons of the Council, 'but sent a private letter to the Pope accompanying the synodical commendation of them.' Hefele (ii. 455, English translation) says that 'all' these canons 'belong to other synods.' A common opinion is that of Hardouin (i. 923, 1220), that this particular canon was of the Synod of Carthage of 407. The question whether this canon was among those reaffirmed by canon 1 of the Œcumenical Council of Chalcedon in 451 (see Hardouin, ii. 602) is discussed by Keble, *Sequel of the Argument against immediately repealing the laws which treat the nuptial bond as indissoluble*, pp. 178-9. The three letters to Innocent, in the sending of which St. Augustine joined in 416 (*Ep.* clxxv., clxxvi., clxxvii.) are on a different question.



communicating those who went through a form of 'marriage' with wives whose husbands were still living.<sup>1</sup>

The testimony of the Fathers begins with a well-known passage in the 'Shepherd' of Hermas. As the right interpretation of the passage has been disputed, it will be necessary for us to quote it at length. The writer of the book is represented in it as carrying on a dialogue with the Angel of Repentance, who has appeared to him in a vision.

'I said to him, Sir, allow me to ask you a few questions. Say on, he said. Sir, I said, if a man should have a wife who is faithful in the Lord' (*i.e.* a Christian) 'and should find her in some act of adultery, does the husband sin if he continues to live with her? As long as he is ignorant [of her adultery], he said, he sins not; but if the husband know of her sin and the wife repent not but continue in the fornication, and if the husband still live with her, he becomes a sharer in the guilt of her sin and a partner in her adultery. What then, Sir, I said, is the husband to do if the wife continue to allow the sin? Let him put her away, he said, and let the husband continue by himself; but if he put away his wife and marry another, he himself also commits adultery. If then, Sir, I said, the woman repent after she has been put away, and wish to return to her own husband, shall she not be received? Yes, he said; if her husband do not receive her, he sins and brings a great sin upon himself; but one who has sinned and is repenting ought to be received, only not often; for to the servants of God there is one repentance. For the sake of the repentance, then, the husband ought not to marry. The matter is the same in the case of a woman and of a man. (Not only, he said, is it adultery if anyone defile his flesh, but also he who makes the images of the heathen commits adultery. Therefore, if anyone continue in such works also and repent not, depart from him and associate not with him; otherwise, thou also art partaker in his sin.) Therefore it is commanded to you, whether husband or wife, to remain by yourselves, for in such there can be repentance. I do not then, he said, give an occasion that this matter so happen, but with the view that one who has sinned may sin no more. But for his former sin there is One who is able to give healing, for He it is who has authority over all things.'<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Canon '6: 'Hi quoque qui alienis uxoribus, superstitionibus ipsarum maritis, nomine conjugii abutuntur, a communione habeantur extranei.' See Hardouin, ii. 779. The date of the Council was 453.

<sup>2</sup> Hermas, *Pastor*, II. iv. i.: Λέγω αὐτῷ· Κύριε, ἐπίτρεψόν μοι ὀλίγα ἑπερωτῆσαι σε. Λέγε, φησὶν. Κύριε, φημί, εἰ γυναῖκα ἔχῃ τις πιστὴν ἐν κυρίῳ καὶ ταύτην εὖρη ἐν μοιχείᾳ τινὶ, ἄρα ἁμαρτάνει ὁ ἀνὴρ συνζῶν μετ' αὐτῆς; Ἀχρι τῆς ἀγνοίας, φησὶν, οὐχ ἁμαρτάνει· ἐὰν δὲ γνῷ ὁ ἀνὴρ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν αὐτῆς, καὶ μὴ μετανοήσῃ ἢ γυνὴ, ἀλλ' ἐπιμένῃ τῇ πορνείᾳ αὐτῆς, καὶ συνζῇ ὁ ἀνὴρ μετ' αὐτῆς, ἔνοχος γίνεται τῆς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῆς καὶ κοινωνὸς τῆς μοιχείας αὐτῆς. Τί οὖν, φημί, κύριε, ποιήσῃ ὁ ἀνὴρ, ἐὰν ἐπιμένῃ τῷ πάθει τούτῳ ἢ γυνὴ; Ἀπολυσάτω, φησὶν, αὐτήν, καὶ ὁ ἀνὴρ ἐφ' ἑαυτῷ μενέτω· ἐὰν δὲ



It has been customary to regard this passage as a clear prohibition of the remarriage of either husband or wife after divorce even for adultery, and subsequent writers have followed Mr. Keble<sup>1</sup> in calling attention to the marked difference between the prohibition that is thus expressed and the counsel not to marry again given to one whose husband or wife is dead.<sup>2</sup>

This interpretation is accepted in the York Report and in the works of Bishop Kingdon, Dean Luckock, and Mr. Watkins. It has lately been challenged by a writer whose lightest word claims attention from students of theology and of the Fathers. In a letter which was published in the *Guardian* of February 6, the Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History at Oxford mentioned Dean Luckock's use of the passage as an instance of 'a strong preconception derived from Latin and English canon law' which, in his opinion, characterized 'the Dean's comments on patristic evidence.' Dr. Bright went on to say :

'A passage in *Hermas* is claimed as "absolutely forbidding the remarriage of either of the separated parties *in the lifetime* of the other" (*Hist. Marr.* p. 82). *Hermas* says nothing about a "lifetime." His ground for prohibiting remarriage is that the guilty wife may repent, and should then be "taken back, *but*," he expressly adds, "*not often, for to the servants of God there is (but) one repentance.*" These words are omitted in Dean Luckock's version, and

ἀπολύσας τὴν γυναῖκα ἑτέραν γαμήσῃ, καὶ αὐτὸς μοιχᾶται. Ἐὰν οὖν, φημί, κύριε, μετὰ τὸ ἀπολυθῆναι τὴν γυναῖκα μετανοήσῃ ἢ γυνὴ καὶ θελήσῃ ἐπὶ τὸν ἑαυτῆς ἄνδρα ὑποστρέψαι, οὐ παραδεχθήσεται; Καὶ μὴν, φησὶν, εἴαν μὴ παραδέξῃται αὐτὴν ὁ ἄνθρωπος, ἁμαρτάνει καὶ μεγάλην ἁμαρτίαν ἑαυτῷ ἐπισπᾶται, ἀλλὰ δεῖ παραδεχθῆναι τὸν ἡμαρτηκότα καὶ μετανοοῦντα· μὴ ἐπὶ πολὺ δέ· τοῖς γὰρ δούλοις τοῦ Θεοῦ μετάνοια ἐστὶν μία. διὰ τὴν μετάνοιαν οὖν οὐκ ὀφείλει γαμεῖν ὁ ἄνθρωπος· αὕτη ἡ πράξις ἐπὶ γυναίκει καὶ ἀνδρὶ κείσται. οὐ μόνον, φησὶν, μοιχεία ἐστίν, εἴαν τις τὴν σάρκα αὐτοῦ μίανῃ, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὃς ἂν τὰ ὁμοιώματα ποιῇ τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, μοιχᾶται. ὥστε καὶ ἐν τοῖς τοιοῦτοις ἔργοις εἰς ἐμμένει τις καὶ μὴ μετανῶν, ἀπέχου ἀπ' αὐτοῦ καὶ μὴ συνζήθι αὐτῷ· εἰ δέ μὴ, καὶ σὺ μέτοχος εἶ τῆς ἁμαρτίας αὐτοῦ. διὰ τοῦτο προσετάγη ὑμῖν ἐφ' ἑαυτοῖς μένετε, εἴτε ἄνθρωπος εἴτε γυνὴ· δύναται γὰρ ἐν τοῖς τοιοῦτοις μετάνοια εἶναι. ἐγὼ οὖν, φησὶν, οὐ δίδωμι ἀφορμὴν ἵνα αὕτη ἡ πράξις οὕτως συντελῇται, ἀλλὰ εἰς τὸ μηκέτι ἁμαρτάνειν τὸν ἡμαρτηκότα. περὶ δέ τῆς προτέρας ἁμαρτίας αὐτοῦ ἐστὶν ὁ δυνάμενος ἰασθαι δοῦναι· αὐτὸς γάρ ἐστιν ὁ ἔχων πάντων τὴν ἔξουσίαν.

<sup>1</sup> Keble, *Sequel of the Argument against immediately repealing the laws which treat the nuptial bond as indissoluble*, 7.

<sup>2</sup> *Hermas, Pastor*, II. iv. 4: 'If a wife or a husband be dead, and one marry, does the person who marries sin? He does not sin, he said; but, if he abide by himself, he gains more abundant honour to himself and great glory with the Lord. But if he marry, he does not sin' (Ἐὰν γυνὴ, φημί, κύριε, ἢ πάλιν ἄνθρωπος τις κοιμηθῇ, καὶ γαμήσῃ τις ἐξ αὐτῶν, μὴ ἁμαρτάνει ὁ γαμῶν; Οὐχ ἁμαρτάνει, φησὶν, εἴαν δὲ ἐφ' ἑαυτῷ μένῃ τις, περισσοτέραν ἑαυτῷ τιμὴν καὶ μεγάλην δόξαν περιποιεῖται πρὸς τὸν κύριον· εἴαν δὲ καὶ γαμήσῃ, οὐχ ἁμαρτάνει).

also in his exhibition of the Latin version of the Greek. Yet surely they are important.<sup>1</sup>

Now, we agree with Dr. Bright that the sentence to which he refers ought not to have been omitted in the quotation. Without it, it is not possible to consider fully what the meaning of *Hermas* is. At the same time, there is no indication of the likelihood of *Hermas* having thought that, supposing a wife who had committed adultery, been separated from her husband, and on repentance reconciled to him, had again fallen into the same sin, the husband would in that case be free to contract a fresh marriage. And—and this is a point of the highest importance—*Hermas* does not only say that the husband must remain by himself because of the possibility of his wife's repentance, but also that if the husband 'marry another woman, he himself also commits adultery,' which would not be true unless there were a bond of marriage which remains unbroken even when the wife is adulterous.

The testimony of Justin Martyr is parallel to that of some Councils which we have noticed. He condemns those 'who by human law are twice married,' but does not say whether he is considering the case of a husband or wife who has been separated from an adulterous spouse.<sup>2</sup>

We doubt whether Bishop Kingdon (p. 47), who is followed by the York Report (pp. 62-3), is wise in the prominence given to the teaching of Athenagoras that 'whoever puts away his wife and marries another commits adultery,' or whether Mr. Watkins (p. 202) exercises his usual judgment in the importance he attaches to it. Athenagoras, as is well known, held views about second marriages of any kind which have not been accepted by the Church of Christ, and which surely deserve a less grudging condemnation than that which Bishop Kingdon awards to them; and it can hardly be possible for anyone who has studied patristic methods of quoting Holy Scripture to be quite without doubt whether it is just to make so much of the fact that 'Athenagoras quotes our Lord's precept without any excepting clause.'<sup>3</sup>

The teaching of Clement of Alexandria<sup>4</sup> is parallel to

<sup>1</sup> *Guardian*, February 6, 1895, p. 202. Dr. Bright wrote further letters in the *Guardian* of February 20 and March 13 and 20.

<sup>2</sup> Just. Mart. *Apol.* i. 15.

<sup>3</sup> Athenag. *Apol.* xxxiii.

<sup>4</sup> Clem. Alex. *Strom.* ii. 23: 'Now that the Scripture counsels marriage and does not allow any departure from the union, it expressly legislates, Thou shalt not put away thy wife except for the cause of fornication; and it accounts a second marriage in the lifetime of either of those who have been separated as adultery' (ὅτι δὲ γαμεῖν ἢ γραφή

that of the Council of Soissons of 744 and those of Rome of 826 and 853.

There is no doubt that Tertullian, after he became a Montanist, held 'marriage' after separation for adultery to be unlawful.<sup>1</sup> But, as in the case of Athenagoras, this fact has to be taken in connexion with the parallel fact that he condemned second marriages of any kind, and, to quote Dr. Bright's letter again,

'As for the *De Monogamia*, where Tertullian says, "To us, even though we divorce, marriage will not be allowed," it is rash to infer a Catholic "law" from the language of an intensely sectarian treatise, directed against all second marriage whatsoever, and illustrating the writer's habitual recklessness when he has a controversial point to maintain.'<sup>2</sup>

There are very few things which are more necessary in dealing with the language of early Christian writers than to observe accurately their standpoint and the real bearing of what they say. Mere collections of unsorted quotations of passages, written under entirely different circumstances and possibly with a different use of language, have unquestionably a tendency to mislead.

Care, then, must be taken not to think too much of Tertullian's statements in the Montanistic treatises, though the consideration pointed out by Mr. Keble that 'he does not charge the "Psychici," as he calls the Church, with allowing divorce as with a corruption (which he would be likely to do, had they really allowed it in any case), but speaks as if they, disallowing it, ought in consistency to be none of them twice married'<sup>3</sup> is of considerable weight.

Still, if, as is our opinion, there is no passage in the earlier treatises of Tertullian which can, with any confidence, be quoted to support or to condemn 'marriage' after divorce,<sup>4</sup>

συμβουλεύει οὐδὲ ἀφίστασθαι ποτε τῆς συζυγίας ἐπιτρέπει, ἀντικρυς νομοθετεῖ· οὐκ ἀπολύσεις γυναῖκα, πλὴν εἰ μὴ ἐπὶ λόγῳ πορνείας· μοιχείαν δὲ ἥγεται τὸ ἐπιγῆμαι (ζῶντος θατέρου τῶν κεχωρισμένων). The question is whether the exception εἰ μὴ ἐπὶ λόγῳ πορνείας is to be read into the last clause or limited to the first. Cf. iii. 6.

<sup>1</sup> Tert. *De Monog.* 9, 10; *Adv. Marc.* iv. 34, v. 7.

<sup>2</sup> *Guardian*, February 6, 1895, p. 202.

<sup>3</sup> Keble, *Sequel of the Argument against immediately repealing the laws which treat the nuptial bond as indissoluble*, pp. 13, 14.

<sup>4</sup> See *De Patientia*, 12: 'It is not lawful for us to remain for a single day without patience. For, since it controls every kind of healthful discipline, what wonder that it even ministers to penitence, which is wont to aid the fallen, since, when marriage is disjoined, yet for this reason for which it is lawful either for a man or a woman to be sustained in persevering in widowhood, this waits, this wishes, this prays for

it is best to put his teaching altogether aside in considering the subject.

The testimony of Origen is of very great interest. Bishop Kingdon in his summary (p. 72) definitely says that he 'prohibits' 'marriage' after divorce, and at an earlier point in his treatise (pp. 52-3) quotes passages to support this view. Dean Luckock, while admitting that 'Origen would not take upon himself to condemn' 'absolutely' those who allowed a different practice, has no doubt that 'the rule and practice of the Church in Origen's time was unquestionably based upon the belief that nothing but death dissolved the marriage bond' (pp. 88-9). On the other hand, Mr. Reynolds, who has evidently spent time and pains on the study of Origen, expresses his judgment that 'he represents the action of a guilty wife as severing the bond'<sup>1</sup> and so making remarriage possible.

Both opinions alike are based upon the long passage in Origen's treatise on St. Matthew's Gospel in which he comments upon the question about divorce which the Pharisees asked and our Lord's reply.<sup>2</sup> This passage was treated years ago with great care by Mr. Keble,<sup>3</sup> and it is obvious that his penitence for those who are some day to enter salvation. How great good it confers on both! The one it prevents from adultery, the other it causes to amend' ('Non licet nobis una die sine patientia manere. At enim cum omnem speciem salutaris disciplinæ gubernet, quid mirum, quod etiam pœnitentiæ ministrat, solitæ lapsis subvenire; cum disjuncto matrimonio, ex ea tamen causa, qua licet seu viro seu femina ad viduitatis perseverantiam sustineri, hæc expectat, hæc exoptat, hæc exorat pœnitentiam quandoque inituris salutem. Quantum boni utrique confert! Alterum non adulterum facit, alterum emendat'). *Ad Uxorem*, ii. 1: 'Let us now turn to the counsel that is next best, in regard to human infirmity, since we are admonished by the examples of certain women who, when an opportunity for continence has been offered by divorce or a husband's death, have not only thrown away the opportunity of so great a good, but have not even in marrying been willing to remember the rule that before all things they should marry in the Lord' ('Nunc ad secunda consilia convertamur, respectu humanæ infirmitatis, quarundam exemplis admonentibus, quæ divortio vel mariti excessu, oblata continentia occasione, non modo abjecerunt opportunitatem tanti boni, sed ne in nubendo quidem rursum disciplinæ meminisse voluerunt, ut in domino potissimum nubere'). The passage in *De Patientia* has been taken to mean that 'marriage' would be 'adultery' in a case where separation had been right: that in *Ad Uxorem* has been interpreted as implying that it was equally lawful for a woman to 'marry' after 'divortium' and after 'mariti excessus.' The argument is precarious in either case. In our opinion the inference from *De Patientia* is better supported than that from *Ad Uxorem*. Compare *Ad Uxorem*, ii. 2. Both these treatises were written before Tertullian became a Montanist. See Fuller in Smith and Wace's *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, iv., 822.

<sup>1</sup> *Origen and the York Report*, p. 8.

<sup>2</sup> St. Matt. xix. 3-9.

<sup>3</sup> Keble, *Sequel of the Argument against immediately repealing the laws which treat the nuptial bond as indissoluble*, pp. 21-7.

interpretation of it underlies what has been written by Bishop Kingdon and Dean Luckock. The Dean's discussion is fuller than that of the Bishop, and we may take his statement as representing the point of view of both. To his mind the whole passage is pervaded by the thought of the 'original design of the Creator' whereby marriage was indissoluble, and regards any 'relaxation' of its indissolubility as a 'concession to man's weakness.' Since such a relaxation was made by Moses and the principle of concession was recognized in the New Testament, it was not to be wondered at that 'it had been recognized also in the government of the Church in regard to' the law of marriage (pp. 86-7). Dean Luckock then quotes two passages, which are the same as those given by Bishop Kingdon (pp. 52-3). They are as follows:<sup>1</sup>

'And before now, contrary to what is written, some rulers of the Church permitted a certain woman to marry during the lifetime of her husband, doing this in opposition to the Scripture in which it has been said "A woman is bound as long as her husband liveth," and again, "The woman shall be called an adulteress if she be joined to another man while her husband is living," not altogether without reason, for it is probable that this concession was permitted through comparison with worse things contrary to that which was ordained from the beginning and written in the Scripture.'

'As the woman is an adulteress, even if she seem to be married to a man while her former husband is still alive, so also a man who seems to marry a divorced woman does not so much marry, according to the decision of our Saviour, as commit adultery.'<sup>2</sup>

Placed close together in this way and read in the light of the concession of the 'rulers of the Church' being parallel to certain concessions in the New Testament, these two passages may not unnaturally be taken to mean that the woman referred to had been put away for adultery and that her subsequent 'marriage' was regarded by Origen as a further act of adultery. This, as we understand them, is the position of Bishop Kingdon and Dean Luckock.

<sup>1</sup> We have aimed at somewhat more literal translation than that in the books referred to.

<sup>2</sup> Origen, *In Matt.* tom. xiv. 23 (t. iii. p. 647, Delarue): "Ἡδὲ δὲ παρὰ γεγραμμένα καὶ τινες τῶν ἡγεμένων τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐπέτρεψάν τινα, ὥστε ζῶντος τοῦ ἀνδρός, γαμεῖσθαι γυναῖκα, παρὰ τὸ γεγραμμένον μὲν ποιούντες ἐν φλέλεκται· γυνὴ δὲ ἐφ' ὅσον χρόνον ζῇ ὁ ἀνὴρ αὐτῆς, καὶ τὸ· ἅμα οὖν μοιχαλὶς χρηματίζει ἢ γυνὴ γενομένη ἀνδρὶ ἐτέρῳ ζῶντος τοῦ ἀνδρός, οὐ μὴν πάντῃ ἀλόγως, εἰδὸς γὰρ τὴν συμπεριφορὰν ταύτην συγκρίσει χειρόνων ἐπιτρέπεσθαι παρὰ τὰ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς νενομοθετημένα καὶ γεγραμμένα. *Ibid.* 24 (p. 649): "Ὡς περ δὲ μοιχαλὶς ἐστὶ γυνὴ, καὶν δοκῇ γαμεῖσθαι ἀνδρὶ, ἔτι ζῶντος τοῦ προτέρου· οὕτως καὶ ἀνὴρ δοκῶν γαμεῖν ἀπολειμμένην, οὐ γαμεί, κατὰ τὴν τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν ἀπόφασιν, ὅσον μοιχεύει."

Probably a good many persons acquainted with the treatise of Origen have shared our surprise that a writer who can have no interest but the establishment of the truth should have given unwary readers no hint that the two passages are separated from each other by a discussion of possible causes of separation which occupies nearly two pages of the Benedictine edition.<sup>1</sup> And it does not increase our confidence in the thoroughness of the Dean's knowledge of the treatise in question to find, from a letter which he addressed to Mr. Reynolds,<sup>2</sup> that a highly important part of Origen's treatment of the question had 'escaped' his 'notice' at the time when he wrote his book.

The York Report is on this point, as with regard to the Fathers and the Councils generally, a mere reproduction of Bishop Kingdon's book, and adopts (p. 65) from him the statement that 'we cannot find any trace that the exception mentioned in St. Matthew was regarded as in any way affecting the unconditional condemnation of such "seeming" or pretended marriages (as Origen calls them). This surely would imply that there was some traditional mode of interpreting St. Matthew, which was tacitly accepted,' and adds at a later point the following sentences:

'The Primitive Fathers . . . quote our Lord's words without allowing any exception or excepting clause; as if there were a traditional and well-understood mode of interpreting any such exception as not applying to Christians. See, *e.g.*, Athenagoras, A.D. 177, Origen, 245 A.D., and others' (pp. 97-8).

We shall have occasion, later on, to refer to our Lord's words. Our present point is the teaching of Origen. And we cannot help feeling that careful students must have been no less startled at the statements we have quoted than at Dean Luckock's silence upon which we have already commented. It is difficult to suppose that either Bishop Kingdon or the compiler of the York Report can have had any accurate recollection of the parts of Origen's discussion which they did not quote; for in the long passage which comes between the two passages which they have given the 'excepting clause'

<sup>1</sup> Dean Luckock writes as if the second passage was expressly connected with the first: 'It deserves our especial notice that Origen guards himself from letting it be supposed that such a union as had been allowed by the above dispensation was an actual legal marriage; for he thus writes: "as the woman," &c. (p. 88).' Bishop Kingdon gives the numbers of the pages, and mentions that the second passage is 'a little later on' than the first (p. 52), but there is nothing to show a reader unacquainted with the passage the importance of what lies between.

<sup>2</sup> See *Origen and the York Report*, Preface, p. i.



in 'our Lord's words' and possible interpretations of it are carefully considered.

Mr. Reynolds' pamphlet on this subject is free from the carelessness it has been our duty to point out in other writers. He calls attention to the 'stress' which 'Origen lays' 'on the words "every cause"' (p. 1), the 'very remarkable sentence' in which 'Origen represents the union of Christ and His Church as a second marriage following after the dissolution of the first by the adultery of the former wife' (p. 2), the treatment of the words 'saving for the cause of fornication,' the absence of any proof that in the historical incident mentioned by Origen 'the separation' of the woman 'from the first husband was occasioned by adultery' (p. 5), and the discussion of the question whether 'a wife' who 'was not convicted of fornication' (p. 6) could lawfully be put away for any other offence. In expressing a hope that 'the whole of' the 'evidence will be carefully gone into and re-examined,' and referring to the allusion in the York Report to Origen as indicating 'a traditional and well-understood mode of applying' the 'excepting clause' in 'our Lord's words' 'as not applying to Christians,' he ventures

'to think it has been proved . . . (1) that Origen understood *πορνεία* to mean adultery, also (2) that he took St. Matthew's Gospel as intended for the whole Christian Church' (p. 9).

Our consideration of the passages in St. Matthew's Gospel must, as we have said, come later. On the teaching of Origen, our opinion, not adopted without hesitation and recognition of much to be said on the other side, is that the passage—

'The woman is an adulteress even if she seem to be married to a man while her former husband is still alive, so also a man who seems to marry a divorced woman does not so much marry, according to the decision of our Saviour, as commit adultery'—

is meant to be a declaration which sums up the whole question by affirming that while separation is lawful for the one cause mentioned by our Lord—*πορνεία*—under no circumstances can there be a valid marriage if the husband or wife of either of the parties is still alive. The argument from the comparison of our Lord with a husband who has married a second wife after the adultery of the first is of weight in support of another interpretation. Our reasons for not allowing it to outweigh the indications which support the opinion we have expressed are, first, that the Jewish synagogue, the first wife, died by reason of the separation, and, in the second



place, that Origen might well use the illustration without meaning it to be in all respects consistently worked out.

The importance of the view of Origen may easily be exaggerated. There are very few matters on which he is a safe guide. So far as he can rightly be quoted at all in this controversy, it is, we think, in support of the indissolubility of marriage. We have treated his opinion at some length partly because of its interest and partly because we wish to enter a protest against the carelessness which disfigures some of the works which we have under review.

We have not referred to Mr. Watkins' learned book in connexion with Origen because, though he quotes a great part of what Origen says, his handling of it seems to us nervous, lacking his usual ability, and inadequate. In writing of the remaining patristic evidence with a brevity which is enforced upon us by the limits of our space, we may avail ourselves of his statement that

'St. Ambrose,<sup>1</sup> St. Jerome,<sup>2</sup> and St. Augustine<sup>3</sup> decline to admit

<sup>1</sup> St. Ambrose's position may be seen by a comparison of *Expos. Evang. Luc.* viii. 2 with *De Abraham*, i. 4 (§ 25).

<sup>2</sup> See St. Jerome, *Eph.* lv. 3, lxxvii.; *Ad Jovin.* i. 10; *In Mal.* (ii. 14); *In Matt. Evang.* (xix.). In the first reference he says: 'As long as the husband liveth, though he be an adulterer, though he be of unnatural vice, though he be guilty of all crimes, and have been left by his wife because of these sins, he is accounted her husband and she may not take another' ('Quamdiu vivit vir, licet adulter sit, licet sodomita, licet flagitiis omnibus coopertus, et ab uxore propter hæc scelera derelictus, maritus ejus reputatur, cui alterum virum accipere non licet'). In the second reference (§ 3) he says: 'What is unlawful for women is equally unlawful for men' ('Quod non licet feminis, æque non licet viris'); and though the particular words apply to indulgence in sin, not expressly to remarriage, the whole context shows that, in St. Jerome's view, they may rightly be so applied.

<sup>3</sup> The teaching of St. Augustine in *De Bono Conjug.* 3-7; *De Conj. Adult.*, *passim*; *De Serm. Dom. in Monte*, i. 14-16 (§§ 39-48); *Serm.* cccxcii. 2, is unmistakable. The passage in *De Fide et Operibus*, 19 (§ 35), does not appear to refer to the marriages of those who have been baptized. It expresses some doubt as to whether the remarriage of a husband who has put away his wife for adultery is sin so grievous as necessarily to exclude one who has committed it from baptism. In the light both of his teaching elsewhere and of the immediate context it can hardly be thought that the sentence, 'Et in ipsis divinis sententiis ita obscurum est, utrum et iste, cui quidem sine dubio adulteram licet dimittere, adulter tamen habeatur si alteram duxerit, ut, quantum existimo, venialiter ibi quisque fallatur,' expresses a real doubt of his own as to the meaning of our Lord's teaching. Rather, the sense is that an ill-instructed person must not be judged too hardly if he misunderstands. In *Retract.* i. 19 (§ 6), he refers to his teaching in the Discourse on the Sermon on the Mount, and does not express any doubt that he taught truly on the subject of remarriage; in *Retract.* ii. 57, he writes as follows with reference to the

remarriage after a divorce for adultery, even in the case of the unoffending husband. On the other hand, Lactantius<sup>1</sup> and Ambrosiaster<sup>2</sup> admit remarriage after a divorce for adultery. In the East St. Basil<sup>3</sup> does not approve of remarriage in any case, but is not prepared to visit such remarriage with harsh discipline in the case

treatise *De Conj. Adult.*: 'Scripsi duos libros de coniugiis adulterinis, quantum potui, secundum Scripturas, cupiens solvere difficillimam quaestionem. Quod utrumque enodatissime fecerim, nescio: immo vero non me pervenisse ad hujus rei perfectionem sentio, quamvis multos sinus ejus aperuerim, quod judicare poterit quisquis intelligenter legit.' This passage appears to us to express hesitation as to the value of some of his arguments rather than about the correctness of his conclusion. Had he come to doubt his former general position, we do not think there could have been so little sign in the *Retractationes* of a change of view. St. Augustine speaks of the whole 'quaestio' as 'difficillima' (*Retract.* ii. 57) and 'obscurissima et implicatissima' (*De Conj. Adult.* i. 25, § 32), but this does not necessarily imply doubt as to conclusions, and the reference to 'sinus' in the immediate context in each treatise is significant. These passages are referred to in Dr. Bright's letters in the *Guardian*, and we have not commented upon them without allowing weight to his intimate knowledge of St. Augustine and patristic theology generally. The use of 'vinculum' and 'solutio' in the sentence which Dr. Bright quoted of fornication from *De Serm. Dom. in Monte*, i. 16 (§ 50), 'ut cum tanto vinculo sibi conjugia constringantur, haec una causa solutionis excepta sit,' may be illustrated from *De Nupt. et Concup.* i. 10 (§ 11), 'Ita manet inter viventes quiddam conjugale, quod nec separatio nec cum altero copulatio possit auferre. Manet autem ad noxam criminis, non ad vinculum foederis,' where 'vinculum foederis' is used in a different sense from, e.g., *De Conj. Adult.* ii. 5 (§ 4).

<sup>1</sup> Bishop Kingdon states the position of Lactantius as 'silent about remarriage of either man or woman' (p. 72), and on p. 54 argues that the statement that 'the Divine law so joins together by an equal law two persons into marriage, that is into one body, that he is reckoned adulterous whoever have wrenched asunder the compacted body' is significant in its intimation that both husband and wife 'are bound alike, and if the bond is broken, it is broken for both.' As Lactantius says that 'he is an adulterer who has married a woman put away from her husband,' this might imply a prohibition of remarriage. It may, however, be doubted whether the Bishop has paid sufficient attention to the exact words of the phrase, 'qui praeter crimen adulterii uxorem dimisit ut alteram ducat' in the sentence 'adulterum esse, qui a marito dimissam duxerit, et eum, qui praeter crimen adulterii uxorem dimisit ut alteram ducat.' Dissociari enim corpus et distrahi Deus noluit' (*Divin. Instit.* vi. 23). The passage is not clear either way; but Mr. Watkins' interpretation may be thought the more probable.

<sup>2</sup> That is, he allows remarriage to the husband of an adulterous wife; he does not allow it to the wife of an adulterous husband. See *In 1 Cor.* (vii. 10, 11).

<sup>3</sup> The teaching of St. Basil is very far from clear, but the view expressed above is best supported. He appears to have been greatly influenced against wishing to enforce what he believed to be right by the laxity by which he was surrounded. The most important passages in his writings are *Moralia*, Reg. lxxiii.; *Ep.* clxxxviii, cxcix, ccxvii, canons 9, 21, 77. Dean Luckock (p. 120) seems to regard canon 77 as a retraction of canon 9.

189  
of f  
St.  
ora  
rem

ing  
we  
inq

the  
mar  
teac  
diff  
Prim  
neve  
any  
ques

1  
καὶ μ  
πρώτ  
πᾶσι  
τησὶ  
γενομ  
θεῖος  
διὰ τὸ  
ἀλλ' α  
ὁ ἄγιο  
ἅλλα  
121-3  
ἡ μοι  
awkw  
shoul  
divorc

2  
in the  
3  
4  
remar  
who is

5  
(vii.);  
referen  
vincul  
adulter  
(pp. 67  
allowin  
6  
xix.; L  
7  
trace of  
printed  
VOL

of the man. St. Epiphanius<sup>1</sup> and St. Asterius<sup>2</sup> admit remarriage. St. Gregory Nazianzen<sup>3</sup> is uncertain, St. Timothy of Alexandria<sup>4</sup> oracular, Theodoret<sup>5</sup> contradictory. St. Chrysostom<sup>6</sup> is against remarriage' (p. 436).

When we have added a reference to Mr. Watkins' interesting treatment of the letters of Pope Innocent I.<sup>7</sup> (pp. 336-9), we are in a position to pass on to a further stage in our inquiry.

V. Our investigation of the history of the question after the year 500 led us to the problem which arose from the marked difference between the teaching of the East and the teaching of the West. Again, we are confronted with some differences of opinion. There can be no doubt that the Primitive Church unhesitatingly answers that remarriage can never be lawful if husband and wife have been separated for any cause other than that of adultery. On the further question, whether adultery in any way severs the bond of

<sup>1</sup> See *Adv. Hær.* lix. 4 : 'Ἐξεστὶ δὲ τῷ λαῷ δι' ἀσθένειαν διαβαστάζεσθαι, καὶ μὴ δυνήντας ἐπὶ τῇ πρώτῃ γαμετῇ στήναι, δευτέρα μετὰ θάνατον τῆς πρώτης συναφθῆναι. Καὶ ὁ μὲν μίαν ἐσχηκὼς ἐν ἐπαίνῳ μέλζονι καὶ τιμῇ παρὰ πᾶσιν ἐκκλησιαζομένοις ἐνυπάρχει· ὁ δὲ μὴ δυνήεις τῇ μιᾷ ἀρκεσθῆναι τελευτήσας ἕνεκέν τινος προφάσεως, πορνείας ἢ μοιχείας, ἢ κακῆς αἰτίας χωρισμοῦ γενομένου, συναφθέντα δευτέρα γυνικί, ἢ γυνὴ δευτέρῳ ἀνδρὶ, οὐκ αἰτιάται ὁ θεῖος λόγος, οὐδὲ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἐκκλησίας καὶ τῆς ζωῆς ἀποκηρύττει, ἀλλὰ διαβαστάζει διὰ τὸ ἀσθενές· οὐχ ἵνα δύο γυναῖκας ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ σκῆ̃ ἐνι περιούσιος τῆς μίας, ἀλλ' ἀπὸ μίας ἀποσχεθεὶς, δευτέρα, εἰ τύχοιεν, νόμῳ συναφθῆναι. Ἐλεεί τοῦτον ὁ ἅγιος λόγος καὶ ἡ ἀγία Θεοῦ Ἐκκλησία· μάλιστα εἰ τυγχάνει ὁ τοιοῦτος τὰ ἄλλα εὐλαβῆς, καὶ κατὰ νόμον Θεοῦ πολιτευνόμενος. Dean Luckock (pp. 121-3) suggests the omission of the clause ἕνεκέν τινος προφάσεως, πορνείας ἢ μοιχείας, ἢ κακῆς αἰτίας χωρισμοῦ γενομένου. The passage is certainly awkward, but the alteration is too great to be made on conjecture. It should be noticed that Epiphanius, if the text gives the right sense, allows divorce and remarriage for other causes besides adultery.

<sup>2</sup> *In Matt. Evang.* (xix.). He speaks of the right of remarriage only in the case of the husband of an adulterous wife.

<sup>3</sup> St. Greg. Naz. *Orat.* xxxvii. 5-8.

<sup>4</sup> St. Tim. Alex. *Inter.* xv. This appears to be a condemnation of remarriage; the question asked is with regard to the husband of a wife who is insane.

<sup>5</sup> Theod. See *Græc. Aff. Curatio*, ix.; *In Mal.* (ii. 13, 14); *In Rom.* (vii.); *In I Cor.* (vii.). Mr. Watkins is of opinion that ζεύγη in the first reference is more probably than not used in the technical sense of *vinculum*. If so, that passage allows remarriage after divorce for adultery. The other passages appear to condemn it. Bishop Kingdon (pp. 67-9, 73) is inclined to take all the passages as consistent and as not allowing remarriage.

<sup>6</sup> The chief passages are in *In Matt. Hom.* xvii., lxii.; *In I Cor. Hom.* xix.; *De Virginitate*, 40; *De Libello Repudii*.

<sup>7</sup> He emphatically prohibits remarriage after divorce; there is no trace of any exception where the divorce is for adultery. The letters are printed in Hardouin, i. 1004-5, 1008.

marriage—whether the innocent husband of a guilty wife, or the innocent wife of a guilty husband, or either husband or wife if innocent of adultery, or either whether innocent or guilty, may contract a new 'marriage,' the position is not the same. We have to ask whether we are to follow the emphatic teaching of *Hermas*, supported as it is, in later times, by the great names of *Ambrose*, *Jerome*, *Augustine*, or whether the exceptional instances are a better guide. Was the allowing of remarriage in any case a concession to the spirit of the world and to secular laws which was contrary to Christian principles, or did the more rigid line involve an undue addition to the severity of the law of Christ?

Our answer must come from the Holy Scriptures. We have the authority of Christ<sup>1</sup> for the statement that in its primitive ideal marriage was indissoluble, and that *Moses*<sup>2</sup> allowed a laxer rule only because of the hardness of men's hearts. Did He, in asserting that husband and wife are united in one flesh, forbid, under all circumstances, the 'marriage' of either of them while the other should live? There are four passages in the Gospels<sup>3</sup> which contain His teaching on the subject. Two of these<sup>4</sup> lay down, without any sign of exception, a law that remarriage is adultery. Of the other two, the first<sup>5</sup> implies that a wife may be put away 'for the cause of fornication,' but, while forbidding the 'marriage' of any divorced woman, says nothing as to the possibility of the 'marriage' of the husband who has put away his wife because of her adultery. If there were no other record of the teaching of our Lord, the natural inference would be that separation is lawful if there has been 'fornication,' but that in no case may there be remarriage. The fourth passage,<sup>6</sup> as it stands in the received text, reads: 'Whosoever shall put away his wife, except for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery, and he who marrieth a woman who has been put away committeth adultery.'

In the *York Report*, the two passages in *St. Matthew's Gospel* are explained by the well-known interpretation which is associated with the name of *Dr. Döllinger*,<sup>7</sup> and which was defended with great skill by *Dr. Liddon*.<sup>8</sup> According to it,

<sup>1</sup> *St. Matt.* xix. 4-6.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* 8.

<sup>3</sup> *St. Matt.* v. 31-2, xix. 3-9; *St. Mark* x. 2-12; *St. Luke* xvi. 18.

<sup>4</sup> *St. Mark* x. 2-12; *St. Luke* xvi. 18.

<sup>5</sup> *St. Matt.* v. 31-2.

<sup>6</sup> *St. Matt.* xix. 9.

<sup>7</sup> *Döllinger, First Age of the Church*, Appendix iii.

<sup>8</sup> *Liddon, University Sermons*, second series, 310-13.

the word *πορνεία* is used in its strict sense of the fornication of an unmarried person; the Jews alone are referred to, and the meaning is that if an unacknowledged act of sin on the part of the woman has preceded the marriage, the man may on discovering it put her away and marry another woman, because the supposed marriage has been vitiated from the first, and consequently the bond has never existed. Bishop Kingdon, following in the main the opinion of Mr. Keble,<sup>1</sup> thinks the passages must refer to the Jews only, and that *πορνεία* is not necessarily to be restricted to sin before marriage. Dean Luckock, considering it likely, though not certain, that *πορνεία* should be limited to sin before marriage and Dr. Döllinger's interpretation accepted, has no doubt that the reference is to the Jews only. On the view, then, of any of these writers, the Christian law of marriage is given completely in the Gospels of St. Mark and St. Luke, and remarriage can never be lawful.

Mr. Watkins, after a most careful investigation of the subject, summarizes his conclusions thus :

'The putting away of a wife for *πορνεία* is held blameless by St. Matthew xix. 9 and St. Matthew v. 32, as it has always been held by the Christian Church. There is no passage which certainly sanctions remarriage after divorce. The text of St. Matthew xix. 9, as it is found in some MSS., appears to do so, at least if the words are held to have reference to the Christian community, and if *πορνεία* be taken to include adultery. But there are extraordinary variations in the readings of this text; the original reading may well have contained no reference to remarriage at all; and in any case the uncertainty of the reading makes it very undesirable to base any argument upon it. Putting this passage aside, the adultery of those who marry again is clearly stated in St. Matthew v. 32 (the woman and her partner), in St. Mark x. 11, 12 (the man and the woman), in St. Luke xvi. 18 (the man and the woman's partner)' (p. 177).

According to Lord Grimthorpe, our Lord sanctioned the 'dissolution of marriage for adultery,' and therefore, since it 'is not dissolution if it means that you must keep your wife still' (p. 334), allowed remarriage.

It is a grave difficulty in the way of Dr. Döllinger's interpretation, which is in some other respects of great probability, that, in spite of its proper meaning, we never find *πορνεία* limited to sin before marriage by the Fathers, and that the interpretation itself appears to have been unknown to them. Nor is it very easy to limit the sayings about divorce in St.

<sup>1</sup> Keble, *An Argument for not proceeding immediately to repeal the laws which treat the nuptial bond as indissoluble.*

Matthew's Gospel to the Jews. But, in our judgment, either the second course or the combination of the two is far less difficult than to suppose that our Lord could have uttered the statements recorded by St. Mark and St. Luke, asserting in the clearest and strongest way the complete indissolubility of the marriage bond, and the declaration in both passages in St. Matthew that marriage with any divorced woman<sup>1</sup> is adultery, if, all the while, He was meaning to allow remarriage to the husband of an adulterous wife. We think it clear that whether the opinion of Dr. Döllinger, or the view of Mr. Keble, or the suggestions of Mr. Watkins indicate the right interpretation of the passages in St. Matthew, the Christian law of marriage is declared in the words 'Whosoever shall put away his wife, and marry another, committeth adultery against her. And if a woman shall put away her husband, and be married to another, she committeth adultery,'<sup>2</sup> and does not admit of exception.<sup>3</sup>

Such a belief is strongly reinforced by St. Paul's words to the Corinthians,<sup>4</sup> and by his comparison of the union between Christ and the Church to the union between husband and wife.<sup>5</sup> It gives force, too, to our Lord's emphatic declaration 'they twain shall be one flesh,' which would be emptied of its meaning, as He Himself declared the concession allowed by Moses was inconsistent with it,<sup>6</sup> if the bond of marriage should be dissoluble.

How, then, are we to account for the occasional failures in teachers and Councils to maintain the law of Christ? Part of the answer is supplied by words of Origen: οὐ μὴν πάντῃ ἀλόγως· εἰκὸς γὰρ τὴν συμπεριφορὰν ταύτην συγκρίσει χειρόνων ἐπιτρέπεσθαι παρὰ τὰ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς νευομοθετημένα καὶ γεγραμμένα ('Not indeed altogether without reason; for it is likely that this concession was permitted through comparison of worse things contrary to that which was ordained from the beginning and written in the Scripture'). The thought that harshness might drive the sinful into further sin, and cause the innocent to lose innocence, has led many earnest Christians to tamper with the teaching of Christ. The other part of the answer is in the relation of the Church to the

<sup>1</sup> ἀπολελυμένην.

<sup>2</sup> St. Mark x. 11-12; cf. St. Luke xvi. 18.

<sup>3</sup> We regret to observe that Canon Gore, in a lecture delivered in Westminster Abbey, while strongly asserting the general 'indissolubility of marriage,' has stated, 'our Lord appears . . . to make an exception, and the exception would appear to sanction the remarriage of the innocent party.' See *Church Times*, March 22, 1895, p. 338.

<sup>4</sup> 1 Cor. vii. 10-11, 39.

<sup>5</sup> Eph. v. 22-32.

<sup>6</sup> St. Matt. xix. 5-8.



State. It was hard enough for the Church to maintain her own law in the face of opposite laws of an unfriendly State. It was far harder when the State ceased to be hostile, and the natural desire to meet secular laws and avoid alienating emperors and statesmen appealed persuasively for the abandonment of rigour.

Eastern Christianity affords the justification of the Church of England, as she appeals to Holy Scripture and the undivided Church against the false claims of the Bishop of Rome. On the subject of marriage there is good reason to think that the general teaching of the West truly interprets the Bible and the voice of the early Church.

VI. Our opinion of the recently published works on the subject of divorce will in many respects have been already indicated. Bishop Kingdon's *Divorce and Re-marriage* contains valuable information, put in a useful shape. We are prepared to accept its main conclusions. Some of its details, as we have indicated, need careful revision. The York Report is not without unsatisfactory features. There are disadvantages, as the Convocation of York has now recognized,<sup>1</sup> in the publication of Convocation Reports upon which no judgment of the House has been passed. It is a little startling to be told by a committee that 'it has been impossible for' its members 'to verify all references,' and that, in effect, they throw the responsibility of statements they should either abstain from making or be prepared to stand by on 'the convener,' who 'has drawn up the Report' (p. 1).<sup>2</sup> It is not a happy plan, in an important document, to take the evidence from the Councils and the Fathers bodily from another work. Inaccuracies upon which we have commented and a general impression of haste which the Report conveys are disfiguring and harmful. We regret that a work of such good intentions, of so great courage, and containing so much of high value, should not have been more carefully prepared so that it might have been published in a form less susceptible to attack. Dean Luckock's *History of Marriage* is written in a most useful form and in an interesting style. It, too, contains valuable matter and it is well arranged. To us, it has not infrequently suggested a doubt whether the respected author has so full a grasp on his subject or so accurate a knowledge

<sup>1</sup> See the resolution passed on February 21 (*Guardian*, February 27, 1895, p. 343).

<sup>2</sup> The Report has now been recommitted 'in order that the committee may 'verify those quotations which they' have 'given to the world, but' have 'not yet verified.' See *Guardian*, February 27, 1895, p. 346.

of patristic theology as is desirable in the writer of such a work. For Mr. Watkins' book we can only have the highest praise. Here and there we may be unable to agree with him on some point of detail; occasionally, as in the case of Origen, he appears to us to fail to grapple with a point of some importance. But, taken as a whole, the book is most masterly. And its sound judgment and strongly marked impartiality give it value as dealing with a subject in which judgment and impartiality are specially necessary. Dean Luckock's work contains matter on the prohibited degrees which is outside the scope of our present article; Mr. Watkins' deals fully with the whole subject of Holy Matrimony. It will be found to be indispensable to students of the subject. Father Convers' *Marriage and Divorce* will be of great usefulness to those who wish to study the practical aspects of a lax law of marriage. It has special bearing on the problems presented by divorce in America. Mr. Reynolds' pamphlets have much merit. They are marked by brevity, clearness, and care. If we do not accept his conclusions, we recognize his skill. Of Lord Grimthorpe's article, with its bad taste and bad temper, it is difficult to write calmly. There are readers who will forgive many offences more readily than his insinuation that Mr. Keble was a dishonest controversialist (p. 333).

VII. The question of divorce is of the most pressing practical kind. If it is true, as we have maintained, that the law of Christ declares the indissolubility of marriage, the Church in England is bound to maintain the sacred character of the marriage bond. Let no one think that this is a mere antiquarian question. It involves in the most practical way loyalty to our Lord. It involves, also, the maintenance of family life, the retention of the influence of home, the protection of purity. The present is no time for playing with any part of the question. The Divorce Act of 1857 has done not a little to justify the forebodings of the magnificent speech in which it was opposed by Mr. Gladstone<sup>1</sup> and the thoughtful words of Mr. Keble's protest.<sup>2</sup> Respectable politicians, including a Cabinet Minister of eminence and ability, have not hesitated to introduce more than once a Bill for greatly extending the causes of divorce.<sup>3</sup> Unless we are mistaken, there are few Churchmen who sufficiently estimate the passionate strength with which the Christian doctrine of

<sup>1</sup> See *Guardian*, August 5, 1857, pp. 626-9.

<sup>2</sup> Keble, *Argument*, &c.; *Sequel*, &c.

<sup>3</sup> See the York Report, pp. 6, 12.

marriage is itself assailed. There is a whole class of literature, to which we do not care to give references, which loses no opportunity of moving towards the recognition of concubinage, terminable at will, as a respectable State equivalent to marriage. There are sober-minded men and women, out of heart with the ills of the world for which in their loss of Christian truth they can see no remedy, who in sad despair are giving up traditional beliefs about marriage as well as about God.

For the Church, to acquiesce in the existing Divorce Act of the State and allow her children to avail themselves of its provisions is to fail in loyalty to Christ. It is to open the door for new laxity. And it may be worth while to point out the special hardness with which any new laxity will press on women. It is woman who suffers most through loose laws of marriage as well as through the breaking up of homes. The injustice to women of the present law will grow to deeper injustice with every relaxation. There may be truth in the saying that the purity of English homes has owed not a little to the fierce hatred of sin in women which has marked a social system indifferent enough to such sins in men. The Divine Wisdom ever brings good out of evil. But none the less Christians are bound before God to aim at justice in such a matter. Even Jerome could write of the purity that is no less binding on both.<sup>1</sup> The Church must be careful to oppose any injustice such as divorce laws mean.

We are continually told of the hardship that would be caused to innocent persons if remarriage could never be allowed. We might point out that these are not, as a rule, the kind of cases in which the relief of the Divorce Court is sought.<sup>2</sup> There is a deeper consideration to which we prefer to point. Hardship, indeed, there may be of the most terrible kind. There may be the wrecked life of a young and innocent wife for whom, if there might be remarriage, there might still be the shelter and comfort of a real home. There may be the misery of a husband, for whom, again, if there might be remarriage, life might be made a different thing. But, whatever such hardships there may be, they are part of what is wider. There are other causes of them than adultery. Insanity, cruelty, imprisonment make hardship for the husband or wife married to the insane, the cruel, or the convict. Some unsought and unlawful passion may make hardship for the one who feels it. Throughout the relations of the sexes, throughout many other departments of life, hardship cannot

<sup>1</sup> St. Jer. *Ep.* lxxvii. 3.

<sup>2</sup> See, *e.g.*, the York Report, pp. 12-14.

be avoided. The existence of it in individuals can never justify the modification of law. The State and the Christian Church alike will find their greatest good in maintaining unbroken the general principles of right. Christians know that the individual who therefore suffers may find his highest welfare in his pain.

We have others to consider besides ourselves. The influence of England in America and the colonies is greater than we sometimes think. The branches of the Church in those countries in communion with the Church in England may be strengthened or weakened by much which we do. Young Churches in the mission field rightly look to us for help.

On every ground—to maintain the law of Christ which Providence has preserved in our own branch of the Church, to protect the best interests of the community at home, to exercise a healthful influence in the Church and in society abroad—we appeal to the Bishops. It is for them to strengthen the hands of the clergy. If they cannot alter the law of the State, they can at least protect the law of the Church. A decision of the English Episcopate declaring to the clergy the indissoluble character of the marriage bond and the need of maintaining the law of marriage by Church discipline, making clear to the laity that the Church in this land has not lost the power of the keys and has voice and strength, would do much for English Christianity and for the moral law.

## ART. II.—ERASMUS AND THE REFORMATION IN ENGLAND.

*Life and Letters of Erasmus.* Lectures delivered in Oxford, 1893-4. By J. A. FROUDE, Regius Professor of Modern History. (London, 1894.)

THIS last fruit of a fertile tree is a worthy conclusion of its bearing. The author was perhaps rejoicing in the sense of his own art when he compared Erasmus's literary skill to that of Horace, who could make a dull journey to Brundisium interesting for all time. For the same admirable grace is found in the biographer himself. Macaulay's quick-trotting sentences and Carlyle's eccentricities of power may be wonderful, yet who would wish to write like them? Professor Froude had a style fit for any subject, and such as any man might imagine himself attaining, so easily does it seem to flow. Any man may imagine

himself attaining it, but if when his page is written he believes it to read like a page of Froude he is a prejudiced self-critic indeed.

Between the charms of the style and the attractions of the subject, this biography of Erasmus is as interesting as the best of novels, and much more so than the second best. If it were not an insult to the muse of history, we should say that a reader of Charles Reade's admirable fiction, *The Cloister and the Hearth*, which tells the story of Erasmus's father, will find all his delight renewed by following on to the biography of the son as set before us in this volume. We do not mean to hint that the work is of kin to a novel, except in its life and interest. On the contrary, we consider this presentation of the great humanist as very just and fair. Its weakness lies in the fact which all the critics have recognized, that Mr. Froude's invincible judgments upon the history of the time enter unchecked and uncorrected into the biography, and fill a larger space in it than the proportions of the work required. Though the life of Erasmus by Mr. Drummond<sup>1</sup> is doubtless inferior in literary skill to the workmanship of Professor Froude, we must confess that it affords more complete materials upon the great man's personality. And there is more than one particular in which the judgments upon public affairs to which Professor Froude is committed, not only exclude interesting personal matter, but warp his opinion upon Erasmus's character and history.

For instance, the writer's determination to hold the worst opinion of monks and friars, for the justification of the later proceedings of his idol, Henry VIII., urges him to stamp with perfect accuracy every invective which Erasmus directs against them. We would by no means argue that this illustrious expositor of falsehood was himself untruthful. But, if we may use academic phrase he was truthful with the truthfulness of *literæ humaniores* rather than with that of mathematics. He has no objection to put, as Johnson has it, a cocked hat on his story and a gold-headed cane in its hand, any more than Livy or Thucydides had to enliven their history with speeches that were never spoken. Professor Froude himself well characterizes his truthfulness (p. 194) by saying that 'he had an intellectual contempt for lies and ignorance backed up by bigotry and superstition;' and equally

<sup>1</sup> *Erasmus, his Life and Character.* By Robert Blackley Drummond. 2 vols. London, 1873. We do not forget the work of Mr. Pennington, which is very meritorious within its limited space, but too much disposed to view the career of its subject from a Lutheran standpoint.

well marks its infirmity when he tells us (p. 31) that 'one must not take too literally the passionate expressions of a sensitive, emotional, and, evidently at the time, distracted man of genius.'

This refers to certain records of Erasmus's life in Paris. But we believe that emotion and passion renewed themselves in his mind whenever he thought of the coercion to which his inexperienced youth had been subjected by inferior men, and especially of the ugly reproach of solemn vows now broken with which they had loaded his memory. Nor can we recognize anything so dangerous in a letter to the court of Leo X. upon the wrongdoings of monks as should forbid our supposing that Erasmus made in it the worst of their misdeeds and the best of his own case. No doubt monasticism was fallen far from its first purity. No doubt culture and enlightenment found no friends among men whose thoughts were imprisoned in their rule. But before we determine to believe that monasticism had been essentially bad for a hundred years before Erasmus, we must forget that Thomas à Kempis, that master of the spiritual life, had been a monk in the very regions where Erasmus's experiences were endured, and lived for four years after the birth of the scholar. The early life of Luther affords no such records of cloistered brutality and self-indulgence as Erasmus relates, and as Mr. Froude would pronounce universal. And if the monasticism of England so soon to be extinguished had left such evil odour behind it, would the monks and friars of Shakespeare have been the unworldly personages that they are?

Professor Froude gives a very plain proof of the limited credit which he extends to Erasmus's truthfulness by translating, with his own inimitable skill, the *Julius Exclusus* (p. 140 *sq.*), the authorship of which the scholar persistently denied. And we may remark that the biographers do not seem to have noticed that an additional reason for the Erasmusian authorship of this relentless satire is found in its resemblance to the savage account of the post-mortem adventures of the Emperor Claudius from the pen of Seneca, a favourite author with Erasmus.<sup>1</sup>

Erasmus was a classicist, a man of the Renaissance. Intellectual restrictions were hateful to him; justly hateful, since he made such noble use of the liberty which he secured for himself at the expense of his vows. He found in his classic authors bright examples of poetry, history, and the observa-

<sup>1</sup> Senecæ *Op.* Elzev. 1679, tom. ii. p. 686; Merivale's *Roman Empire*, ch. I.



tion of life—of the kindness and the satire which were alike dear to him—and in the Christian Fathers who wrote before the structure of formal knowledge which surrounded him was erected, he found the true authorities for Christian life. All these priceless treasures had been accumulated in times of liberty. By liberty alone could they be recovered for future times, and turned to the uses of new Christian generations. It was natural that the scholar should resent the attempt to fetter him.

Erasmus lived just at the time when his learning and his wit could win the highest appreciation. The Latin tongue in which his scholarship moved him to write was still the universal language of readers. And if readers were panting for better supplies of knowledge from a past so sacred to them, and yet so hidden from their eyes, they were also as eager to be amused as the very customers of Mr. Mudie. Erasmus had it in him to supply both wants, and when we learn that the *Praise of Folly* was published at the same time as the Greek Testament, it is as if we heard that Bishop Lightfoot on the morrow of the appearance of the *St. Ignatius* had sent out *Vanity Fair*.

Even in the latter days of Erasmus himself much was changed. The intellectual division of labour became inevitable. Religious questions waxed so desperately earnest, and reading spread so widely, that nothing but vernacular tongues could answer the need. The stores upon which scholarship drew became immense, Erasmus himself being among their chief contributors, and there was no longer room for a man to be at the same time a popular writer of fiction, an editor of Fathers, and a theological disputant. There could not have been another Erasmus in any age since his own, or, to speak more correctly, Erasmus in any age since his own must have written in a different language and for a different public; for the whole reading community of some one of the great nations, instead of the learned of them all. If his letters were 'humaniores' in comparison with the school divinity of his time, Luther and Montaigne and Shakespeare supplanted them as the century ran on by something more human still.

And this has made a great change in the meaning of classicism to our minds. Erasmus's studies in the classics are excursions into the land of liberty. There lay human nature undrilled and free to speak. There were the studies fit to delight the minds which desired liberty more than they feared licence. But so far has modern literature outrun the Renaissance that classicism stands for us as the observance of

form in opposition to the unrestrained luxuriance of later thought. And, in truth, developments of classicism grew up even in Erasmus's own time which he set himself distinctly to resist. Bishop Fitzgerald, an able historian, very sympathetic with Erasmus, is of opinion that the true design of his famous dialogue, the *Ciceronian*, is commonly misunderstood.<sup>1</sup>

'At first glance the reader might suppose that he held in his hand a mere satire upon the Italian purists, intended for no higher end than to ridicule a sickly fastidiousness about the style of Latin composition. But, in truth, its great author had a much greater object in view, and the furious resentment of the powerful personages whom he provoked shows that they well understood how thoroughly he had penetrated their secret. The fact is this. The profligacy of the clergy had produced as its natural consequence irreligion. Conscious that it was by trick and imposture their own system was supported, and, at the same time, ignorant of the true faith and its evidences, they could hardly fail of drawing the inference that Christianity itself was but a gainful delusion, while yet there was something in it (even in the base form it was compelled to wear) that made its awful denunciations against hypocrisy and impurity a heavy burden on its professors. Now, consider the effect which the recovery of the old pagan literature, in all the freshness and grace of novelty, must have had upon minds so prepared. Here they found whatever could encourage their profligate sensuality; here whatever might refine the taste or captivate the fancy. Here were unlocked for them all the treasures of ancient atheism in its most attractive and elegant disguises; here they found a popular mythology exactly suited to their purpose, beautiful in its forms, romantic in its fables, not grasping the mind like Christianity with a firm and unrelaxing hand, but holding it in airy and elastic fetters. . . . In short, the genius of paganism appeared to be on the point of becoming again triumphant in its ancient form, and Erasmus saw with alarm that in the very capital of Christendom, and beside the chair of its first bishop, the very semblance of a Christian profession was rapidly disappearing.'<sup>1</sup>

It may be that a set purpose of restoring heathenism is here ascribed to what was but an unconscious tendency, and that ridicule of a forced and exaggerated classicism of style held a more prominent place in Erasmus's design than the bishop supposes. But, that besides the exquisite literary ridicule of the *Ciceronian*, there lay in its author's intention an imputation of heathenism against the Italian Renaissance, is upon the face of the work. And what the bishop does not observe is the fearful ease with which a secularized Papacy

<sup>1</sup> *Lectures on Ecclesiastical History*, by William Fitzgerald, Bishop of Killaloe. London: Murray, 1885, ii. 180.

mi  
nee  
Ch  
leg  
the  
ext  
imp  
beli  
abu  
and  
old  
troc  
to l  
that  
day,

sion  
thou  
he w  
perv  
or th

re  
had  
not  
man  
denc  
it be  
Fren  
Eras  
the n  
faith,  
powe

M  
most  
Arian  
conce  
And  
verba  
consi  
templ  
doctri

<sup>1</sup> E  
Lond  
<sup>2</sup> P

might assume the place of a heathen imperialism. What need of restoring the religious profession of old Rome if Christianity might take the same form—namely, that of a legal religion the head and representative of which should be the ruler of Rome, which should secure a uniformity of external discipline and worship among the nations without imposing upon any an impossible earnestness of spiritual belief or moral practice? The Papacy of the time was abundantly secular enough to be the head of such a system; and in the very region of Bologna where Erasmus saw the old warrior Julius II. make his entry at the head of his troops, like a consul in his triumph, a modern writer finds to his high approval a heathenism even more ancient than that of Rome flourishing in all its fleshly naturalism to this day.<sup>1</sup>

The sight of Julius in his warlike array produced a repulsion in the mind of Erasmus which never left him. Tinged though he might be with the humanism of Greece and Rome, he was a genuine believer in Christ, incapable of helping the perversion of Christian episcopacy into a carnal monarchy, or that of Christian language into heathen Latinity.

Mr. Froude considers that Erasmus had much intellectual resemblance to Voltaire.<sup>2</sup> There is no doubt that his mind had a sceptical turn and his wit a sarcastic vein, which did not cease to work even in presence of holy things. But many a good Christian has had an intellect of sceptical tendency and a sarcastic turn does not make a Voltaire unless it be accompanied by Voltaire's unsparing irreverence. The Frenchman whom we should regard as the completion of Erasmus is not Voltaire but Pascal, in whom the intellect, the moral earnestness, the sarcasm, the scepticism, and the faith, all of which existed in Erasmus, appear in a form more powerful and more intense.

Mr. Drummond, as a Unitarian, naturally makes the most of Erasmus's charitable concession that among the Arians there were men who believed that what they taught concerning Christ was in accordance with truth and piety.<sup>3</sup> And he shows very plainly<sup>4</sup> that Erasmus did not hold the verbal inspiration of Holy Scripture. Bishop Fitzgerald considers it probable that in the bottom of his heart he contemplated a much larger change in the system of Church doctrine as likely to be the ultimate though gradual effect of

<sup>1</sup> *Etruscan Roman Remains in Popular Tradition*, by C. G. Leland. London, 1892.

<sup>2</sup> P. 26.

<sup>3</sup> Vol. ii. 185.

<sup>4</sup> *Ib.* pp. 364, 365.

his method of reformation than ever was attempted by Luther.<sup>1</sup>

But the reverential and conservative elements of his mind were characteristic and powerful. They form, indeed, the religion of a literary man of wide reading, which can hardly be so enthusiastic as that of a worker. The very act of writing about faith and reverence cools their ardour unless the writing be essentially devotional. The moderation, the balance, the constant habit of inquiry, which are necessary equipments of the historian and the critic, compel them to assume the attitude of persons who prefer one form of faith among many which have interest and merit, not that of fervent attachment to one form of devotion under the pressure of which all merits elsewhere found are forgotten. But we cannot doubt the sincerity of Erasmus's attachment to the Catholic faith, nor of the anxiety which he felt for the spread of Christian virtue. His enthusiasm was moral rather than theological. He would have wished less imposition of ceremonies and more teaching of conduct, but he never imagined Christian conduct to be possible apart from spiritual faith in the person and presence of Christ.

And that brings us to consider the relations of Erasmus to the Reformation. It is related by Professor Froude with the utmost life and truthfulness, though the narrative does not enter into the theological particulars without which it cannot be considered complete. To Erasmus the moral aspect of the movement was the most important by far. To say truth, Erasmus knew too much of what was to be said *pro* and *con* in doctrinal matters to take any enthusiastic interest in a correction of current notions from the doctrinal side. The doctrinal enlightenment for which he hoped was to come from the gradual spread of light, and from the publication of the best sources of primitive truth. Meanwhile the pressing question with him was, how to promote Christian living. It was not so with Luther. His was a theological genius. Although he appeared to the men of his time, and presents himself in history, as a bold opponent of practices revolting to reason, and a passionate advocate of the rights of man against sacerdotalism; yet it was not really in this purely human character that he fought. Already, long before the struggle came, he was pledged and committed, mind and soul, to the theology of Augustine.<sup>2</sup> The secular princes and people knew little of such matters. But a trained scholar like

<sup>1</sup> *Lectures on Ecclesiastical History*, ii. 185.

<sup>2</sup> Seebohm, *Oxford Reformers*. London, 1867, p. 329 *sq.*

Erasmus was aware that what was offered to him by Luther was not the choice between maintaining an old system and destroying it, but between retaining an old theology and introducing a new one. For, though Augustinianism had ever been the recognized mind of the Church on the question of grace and free-will, yet Augustinianism, checked and balanced by the practical operation of Church authority and sacramental doctrine, was a very different thing from Augustinianism dragged into the forefront of Christian teaching, stripped of all accompanying corrections, and pressed upon the individual judgment and consciousness of every man. But by what means, or in what form, could the deep and abstract doctrines of human depravity, and predestinating grace, and Christ's meritorious satisfaction in its extreme form of substitution, be offered to the acceptance of the plain man as a competitor with the mediæval system for his unlearned faith? By the doctrine of Justification by Faith, cried Luther.

Now, though from the pages of Professor Froude<sup>1</sup> it might be supposed that this great controversy was one which Erasmus regarded lightly, yet in truth he also believed in Justification by Faith; who can disbelieve it who holds to the New Testament?

'Since sin alone [says the Paraphrase on Romans v. 1] causes the breach between God and man, after we are made righteous out of sinners and that not by the Mosaic law, which rather increased our offence, nor by the merits of our own deeds, but after the example of our father, Abraham, we are reconciled to God our Father, by faithful commending ourselves to Him, to whom also Abraham became a friend, as the reward of his faith; and that not through Moses, but through the only-begotten son of God, our Lord Jesus Christ, who, washing out our sins by His blood, and by His death reconciling God to us, who was before angry with us for our guilty deeds, opened to us an access whereby, through the means of faith, without the aid of law or circumcision, we might be brought to this grace of the Gospel.'

Such a version of Justification by Faith did not satisfy Luther, to whom it appeared that Erasmus restricted the term law to the Jewish law, and left us open to believe that we could be justified by other forms of obedience, though not by the Mosaic.

We do not believe this to be a true interpretation of Erasmus, who in the above extract includes all merit of our own deeds in the same failure as the works of Jewish law. Erasmus's doctrine seems to be this: that faith introduces

<sup>1</sup> See the Epistle translated on p. 311.

into grace, and keeps us there through the risen life of the Lord, who died for us, 'lest,' as he explains upon v. 9 of the same chapter, 'we fall back into the old enmity with God.' This is a doctrine perfectly free from the charge of self-justification. It ascribes everything to God, through Jesus Christ. There can be no doubt of its moral tendency, for it establishes a living connexion with the Lord Jesus as dead and risen again, which endows us, through union with Him, with the righteousness which is of faith; a holiness like His own, for which we are never to praise ourselves, since it is the gift of God, but from which sin withdraws us because it loses, for the time at least, the hold of faith on Him. Faith is contrary to sin, and sin to faith.

What was Luther's doctrine of Justification? We give it from his commentary on Galatians ii. 16:

'When thy conscience is terrified with the law, and wrestleth with the judgment of God, ask counsel neither of reason nor of the law, but rest only upon grace, and the word of consolation, and so stand herein as if thou hadst never heard anything of the law, ascending up to the glass of faith, where neither the law nor reason do shine, but only the light of faith, which assureth us that we are saved by Christ alone, without any law. . . . Notwithstanding, we must hearken also unto the law, but in place and time. Moses, while he was in the mountain, where he talked with God face to face, had no law, made no law, ministered no law. But when he was come down from the mountain he was a lawgiver, and governed the people by the law. So the conscience must be free from the law, but the body must be obedient to the law.'

It will be remembered that the law in Luther's use means emphatically the moral law of God. Strange, that Moses should be supposed to have gone up to God for any purpose but to receive the law from Him, and bring it to the people as from Him.

Again:

'A man beginneth to sigh, and saith in this wise: Who, then, can give succour? For he, being thus terrified with the law, utterly despaireth of his own strength; he looketh about and sigheth for the help of a Mediator and Saviour. Here then cometh in good time the healthful word of the Gospel, and saith: Son, thy sins are forgiven thee! Believe in Christ Jesus, crucified for thy sins. If thou feel thy sins, and the burden thereof, look not upon them in thyself, but remember that they are translated and laid upon Christ, whose stripes have made thee whole. . . . And here it is necessary that you know the true definition of Christ. The schoolmen, being utterly ignorant hereof, have made Christ a judge and a tormentor, devising this fond fancy concerning the merit of congruence and worthiness. But



Christ, according to His true definition, is no lawgiver, but a forgiver of sins and a Saviour. This doth faith apprehend and undoubtedly believe, that He hath wrought works and merits of congruence and worthiness before and after grace, abundantly. . . . Here, then, it is to be noted that these three things—faith, Christ, acceptance and imputation—must be joined together. . . . This is the means, and this the merit whereby we attain the remission of sins and righteousness. Because thou believest in me, saith the Lord, and thy faith layeth hold upon Christ, whom I have freely given to thee that He might be thy Mediator and High Priest, therefore art thou justified and righteous. . . . We do therefore make this definition of a Christian : that a Christian is not he which hath no sin, but he to whom God imputeth not his sin, through faith in Christ. This doctrine bringeth great consolation to poor afflicted conscience.'

Luther's defenders have, of course, been able to produce out of his works many passages of clearer moral tendency than these. No one could declare himself indifferent to morality ; especially not a reformer moved to indignation by the moral defects of the Pope, and who compels us to accept his teaching upon the matters of our salvation, mixed with never-failing contempt and reviling of Romanism. But these passages give the gist of the system. In it the object in which we believe is Christ as atoning for our sins ; faith consists in understanding the scheme of atonement by imputation and approving its application to our own case ; and good conduct has no immediate connexion either with Christ above or with our faith here below ; it is an affair of the body not of the soul, of the base of the mount of God not of the summit ; the whole business of justification must be concluded before we come to questions of conduct, and must ever after be kept out of any such connexion.

Erasmus professed himself unable to understand how good works were supposed necessarily to flow from the Lutheran doctrine of justification. We must confess our agreement with him. We cannot understand its moral tendency, either when we consider faith as existing in ourselves or as apprehending Christ. It is subject to the very charge of introducing human merit which its great author brought against the schoolmen, who taught that faith must be endowed with form in us by love before it can draw down its promised blessing from God. For Luther's faith must be endowed with form by the apprehension of the Atonement and by the renunciation of merit on our part. It is a mental work within us, consisting of thoughts and feelings distinctly separated off from the other acts of life ; not properly meritorious, of course, but still, having a secondary merit as pleasing God by

acceptance of His grace. And this, we may remark, is the only kind of merit which need be ascribed by any Roman Catholic either to congruity or condignity. Luther's notion of faith, as confidence in the Atonement of Christ has often produced noble and holy characters by the sheer force of the knowledge of Christ, whom they thus approached. But the holiness came, not from the doctrine, but from Christ's grace extending itself beyond the bounds of mere confidence and into parts of the soul less selfish than the desire of personal salvation. There is no reason offered by Luther why the comfort of transferring a sin to Christ, which he bids the soul apply to itself after a fall, should not be used habitually, as well as occasionally, and for the greatest offences as well as for the least.

When we regard the character of Christ, to which faith clings, we find Luther condemning the schoolmen with scorn for imagining that it apprehends Him in any other aspect than that of a Saviour. He must not be thought of either as lawgiver or as judge. Now, God forbid that a Christian teacher should forget to point to Christ as a Saviour, and the only Saviour. We cannot doubt that this is the leading notion of His Mission, for 'Jesus Christ came into the world to save sinners.' But to say that this is the only character in which faith must regard Him is to shut our eyes to distinct revelations and refuse our faith to things for which the Lord Himself demands it. How are we to refuse the character of lawgiver to the Author of the Sermon on the Mount? How are we to deny the character of Judge to Him who solemnly depicts His own judgment of all nations? How are we to have faith that the Lord suffered for us without believing that at the same time He left us an example that we should follow in His steps? If we omit from the sphere of our faith in Christ any of the truths which the New Testament reveals concerning Him, we are imposing a restricted and unauthorized sense even upon that truth of the Atonement which we profess to retain. The lawgiving, the example, and the judgment are not independent of the doctrine of salvation, nor it of them. In the law-giving and the example we find the tests of true acceptance of the salvation, and in the judgment we see the responsibilities under which it is offered.

Those who accept the Lutheran doctrine of justification seem to regard it as too plain for argument, that the faith which is required for free justification is that which acknowledges that we are freely justified. To apprehend the doctrine and consent to it seems to be obviously that which ought to be

requ  
of th  
und  
exa  
be s  
is su  
ham  
forg  
of fa  
varie  
dema  
of th  
they  
an u  
draw  
T  
in th  
of th  
prou  
casts  
call o  
man  
of giv  
exem  
princi  
earth  
the p  
endur  
a sou  
world  
kinds  
God r  
redem  
gifts,  
only t  
the Ne  
But  
suited  
the ab  
has no  
cast de  
of his  
life is,  
work o  
simplic

required of those who are to enjoy its benefits ; and the grace of the Atonement comes by a sort of condignity on those who understand and consent to it. But if anyone will study the examples of faith given us in the New Testament he will be surprised to find how little this apparently obvious truism is supported by an induction of instances. The faith of Abraham, which was counted for righteousness, had not free forgiveness through Christ for its object at all. The examples of faith in Hebrews xi. seem to be deliberately chosen for their variety, and none of them have the character which Luther demands for justification. And when particular descriptions of the subject of saving faith are given in the New Testament, they seldom—if we may not say never—bear the character of an understanding on man's part of all the blessing which it draws down from God.

The correspondence between faith and the reward of faith in the New Testament does not lie in man's comprehension of the doctrine by which he benefits, but in the absence of proud self-sufficiency, and in the absoluteness with which he casts himself upon God. Every situation in life and every call of duty, of whatsoever kind it be, offers an occasion to man of throwing himself upon God, and to God an occasion of giving His aid. And if this disposition on each side is exemplified in any case, that is a proof of the working of the principle which prevails in all cases. Be it with regard to earthly things or spiritual, to the forgiveness of our sins or the purifying of our hearts, to the performance of duty or the endurance of pain, to the cure of a child or the salvation of a soul, he that casts himself upon the powers of the unseen world will find them come to his aid, bringing with them all kinds of blessings unthought of by him. Jesus Christ is of God made unto us wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption. And the man who, in search of any of these gifts, truly believes in Him as its giver, will have in Him not only that gift which he sought but the rest besides. This is the New Testament doctrine of faith.

But to recognize such wide scope for faith would not have suited Luther's purpose. For if faith have this wide scope, the absence of faith must have a scope as wide. A man who has not faith enough to follow Christ in action must thereby cast doubt upon the proof of his faith which the confidence of his feeling furnishes. The whole work of faith in man's life is, by this explanation, bound together in unity, and the work of faith ought to be found in every part of it. The simplicity of such a conception well suits the New Testament

doctrine of the universal lordship of Christ over the dead and the living, and is wide enough to include all the various forms of earnest faith which the Christian centuries have displayed.

But Luther wished to separate the work of faith and justification from all the rest of life—to finish and write off that great transaction as complete, before talking of submission to God or acceptance of Christ in any other department. This restriction of the business of justification could alone furnish him with a message fit to be contrasted with the papal gospel and a war cry to hurl back defiance against all the Roman facilities for obtaining forgiveness. Trust Christ and give yourself to Christ in thought and action, for life and for death, is Christianity as the saints have read it. But that was too long and too spiritual a business to satisfy men who might buy indulgences from the Pope if they liked. It must be remembered that the Lutheran doctrine was not reserved for the comfort of the spiritually-minded or the refined. It was used as a rallying cry to the princes and peoples of Germany, of whom many were sensual and many lawless. And what was the argument for good living which Luther proposed to such men?—

‘When God sees that truth is ascribed unto Him and that He is honoured by the faith of our heart with all that honour which is due unto Him, He in return honours us by imputing unto us truth and righteousness because of this faith only. For it is faith that does truth and righteousness<sup>1</sup> by ascribing unto God His own; and in return God rewards that, our righteousness, with glory. . . . Thus the believing soul, by the pledge of faith in Christ her spouse, becomes free from all sins, secure from death, safe from hell, and endowed with the eternal righteousness, life, and salvation of her husband Christ. . . . From these things you may again understand why it is that so much is attributed to faith, that it alone fulfils the law and justice without any works whatever. . . . Suffice it to have spoken thus concerning the inward man, his liberty and his glorious righteousness by faith, which needs neither law nor good works; nay, they tend to the destruction of anyone who should pretend to be

<sup>1</sup> We quote this passage from an extract from Luther’s treatise on Christian Liberty, adduced by Principal Wace in the appendix to the *Bampton Lectures* for 1879, in order to defend the reformer against Professor Mozley’s accusation that faith with Luther is ‘a pure and abstract faculty of confidence.’ But Dr. Wace (or rather Mr. Cole, from whose translation he quotes) is plainly in error in rendering *facili veritatem et iustitiam* by ‘makes truth and righteousness.’ The meaning is as we have rendered it, and who can find any statement from Luther’s opponents in which the forgiveness of God is made more dependent upon a work on our part?—only, the work by which Luther would have us do truth and righteousness is that of mentally ascribing His own to God.

justified by them. Now let us come to the other part of our subject, the outward man . . . as to his spirit, which is free, he worketh not, but as to his body in which he is subject, he worketh all things. . . . For as the soul is purified by faith and made to love God, it would that all things were purified with it, especially its own body, that all things might join with it in loving and praising God.<sup>1</sup>

We find in this passage a separation between the spiritual and moral life, between the inward and outward parts of man, and between faith and goodness, which is most untrue both to the teaching of the New Testament and to the facts of human nature. And when once the business of justification is concluded and eternal life made sure, we find the reasons for holy living very weak and shadowy, and pure matter of discretion with any man whether he will obey them or not. We need not, therefore, wonder that the testimony to the immoral effects of the Lutheran reformation should be of so startling a character, and that its pious adherents should have been driven to despair by the licence of so many of their associates.<sup>1</sup>

Erasmus was more to be pitied when Luther took up the cause of reform in so wilful a spirit than Luther himself when the Anabaptists outran him. Erasmus was a friend of reform ; not vehement or enthusiastic, for he was a literary man of delicate health, but still so steady in his reforming desires as to spend untiring labour in producing, one after another, those monuments of primitive religion which he believed to furnish the best models of reform. But he was so constituted that reform for him meant higher morality. Morality requires theology to maintain it, but no theology seemed to Erasmus so sure as the moral principles of the gospel, nor any theological teaching valuable except as better fitted to recommend them. It was trying, indeed, for him to see the rise of a leader endowed with all that popular power and vigour which he himself wanted, preaching reform and claiming his assistance to do so, yet so perverse and exaggerated as to leave it uncertain whether, in the supreme matter of Christian living, his success might not leave society as badly off as before, or even worse.

We must agree with Mr. Froude and Mr. Drummond that in these difficult circumstances the conduct of Erasmus towards Luther was on the whole good and true. He ever

<sup>1</sup> Quotations from Erasmus, showing his moral repugnance to the first effects of the Reformation in Germany, will be found in abundance in the opening chapter of v. Döllinger's *Reformation* (French translation by Perrot, Paris, 1848).

did justice to the character of Luther ; he dissuaded both pope and emperor from violent measures of repression. And if, when the progress of division obliged him to take the conservative side, his expressions of papal enthusiasm somewhat outran the cooler utterance of earlier times, that was perhaps an inevitable development for which the times were more to blame than Erasmus. He was forced against his will to assail Luther's doctrine, and when obliged to do so he chose a point of assault little fitted to excite the multitude. We believe that Professor Froude's view of Erasmus's reasons for assailing Luther's doctrine of the will is correct. But he does not notice the remarkable fact that the doctrine of the bondage of the will was greatly dropped by Luther in his later years, and has remained the inheritance, not of Lutherans, but of Calvinists: no small compliment to the discernment and power of Erasmus. Although Erasmus endured the reproach of half-heartedness from Luther, yet the principles which he advocated may well have done a more lasting and durable work of reform than the doctrinal radicalism of the German, which has shown itself so little capable of forming a permanent basis on which to build a Church. The spirit of Erasmus was more scientific, more inductive, of wider range. And proud though the Germans may be of their great reformer, there is probably more of Erasmus that is still alive and influential than of Luther.

The chief interest to English Churchmen in the life of Erasmus is his influence on the English Reformation, and upon this point the information to be obtained from Professor Froude is meagre and inadequate. No foreign reformer has had more power in the Church of England than Erasmus. The direct influence of Luther, Calvin, or Bucer may, indeed, be more heard of in the history of our reformation ; Erasmus belonged to the earlier generation of Colet, whose wise and noble impulse, though not so plainly written in our formularies, yet represented better than any other the spirit into which the Church of England finally settled. But no reformer, whether of home or foreign origin, had so much to do with introducing the Bible to the English people as Erasmus. His New Testament in Greek was the hand-book of the learned, and his paraphrases, placed in 1548 with the Bible in every church, were the explanation of its difficulties both for priests and people in England.

We have pointed out in a former volume of this Review<sup>1</sup> the great importance possessed by the expositions of Erasmus

<sup>1</sup> *Church Quarterly Review*, vol. v. p. 274.



upon the passages of Scripture which furnish the sentences for creating bishops and priests in the English Ordinal of Edward VI. At the very time when the Ordinal was published, the 'Paraphrase' of Erasmus was sanctioned for an authoritative use in the Church of England which has never been extended to any other uninspired work, and this enables us to feel quite sure that the sentences were intended to be understood as Erasmus expounded them: that is to say, St. John xx. 22, 23, as the best expression of the desire to make presbyters such as the Lord ordained, and 2 Tim. i. 6, as the best form for consecrating bishops like to those whom the Apostles made. It would be quite absurd to suppose that any scholar of the time could be ignorant of the work of Erasmus upon the Bible. And of all parts of Europe it would be most unlikely that such ignorance or disregard should exist in England with which Erasmus had been brought into such familiar contact; and of all living Englishmen it would be least probable that Cranmer should have been unmoved by Erasmus's influence, of which he had shown his value by continuing to the scholar the pension settled on him by Archbishop Warham.

The reader, therefore, will not be surprised if we should be able to show him an instance of Erasmus's influence upon the English formularies more important still, if possible, than that of the sentences of ordination. The actual sources of the first Communion office of Edward VI.'s reign form a subject of great interest, yet on which our liturgical writers have not perhaps afforded us much information. There is some justice in the criticism of our learned Roman Catholic contemporary, Father Gasquet,<sup>1</sup> that the parallels to the Prayer-Book which our scholars adduce from ancient liturgies are generally illustrations of our form rather than records of its genesis. This able writer himself furnishes no small assistance in filling the gap. He shows plainly and systematically what stores were open to the compilers of 1549 to give them assistance in their task. He notes, for instance, that the Greek Liturgies were well known; and, in particular, that Erasmus made a translation of the Liturgy of St. Chrysostom as early as 1510, which he communicated to Fisher and Colet. This translation, Father Gasquet informs us, was printed at least four times before 1549. His expression indicates his belief that it may have been printed oftener, and we are able to extend his list of editions by one, at all events—a little volume issued at

<sup>1</sup> *Edward VI. and the Book of Common Prayer* (London, 1890), chap. xii. p. 187.

Antwerp, 1544, with the following title: 'Sacri Sacerdotii defensio contra Lutherum per RD Joannem Episcopum Roffen. Ejusdem psalmi seu preces. Item Missa S. Chrysostomi ab Erasmo Roterodamo in gratiam R. Episcopi Roffen. versa.'

However valuable may be Father Gasquet's information on the Prayer-Book of 1549, he casts little light upon the most important point in the whole—the Consecration of the Holy Eucharist. It is true that he labours to prove that the recital of the words of Institution in that book was taken from the Lutheran Liturgy of Brandenburg Nuremberg; but we need not consider this point, for the words of Institution were not in that book the words of Consecration. Of the Invocation which in 1549 preceded the words of Institution, Father Gasquet writes: 'There can be no reasonable doubt that this passage was suggested by the invocation of the Holy Ghost found after the words of Institution in the Greek Liturgies.'<sup>1</sup> And he names the Liturgy of St. Basil as probably the direct source of the wording of the passage. But he says nothing of the fact that the consecration was in the book of 1549 effected by the Invocation.

The form ran as follows: 'Hear us, O merciful Father, we beseech Thee, and with Thy Holy Spirit and Word vouchsafe to bless and sanctify these Thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine, that they may be unto us the Body and Blood of Thy most dearly beloved Son Jesus Christ, who, in the same night that He was betrayed, took bread,' &c. This resembles the prayer which in the Sarum Use preceded the consecration only, with the significant addition of the Invocation of the Holy Spirit and the crossing of the elements in connexion therewith. No manual acts are directed in connexion with the words of Institution except taking the paten and cup into the hands. It thus seems plain that the act of consecration was in that book transferred from the words of Institution on which for so many centuries the Western Church had believed it to depend, to the sentence of Invocation introduced before their repetition.

Now, when we ask for the source of so momentous a change we must remember, in the first place, that the new form might well be regarded as corresponding best to the history of the Lord's acts recorded in the New Testament, where the natural meaning of what is told us would seem to be that the consecration was effected by His blessing of the elements after He took them into His hands, and that

<sup>1</sup> *Op. cit.* p. 204 n.

the words 'This is my Body' and 'This is my Blood' were the statement of the change which had taken place rather than the words which effect it. Father Gasquet himself<sup>1</sup> furnishes quotations to show that this highly reasonable view was largely held at the time of which we treat.

But, as regards ecclesiastical precedent, Father Gasquet represents the testimony of the Eastern Liturgies by saying that in them the Invocation is found 'after the words of Institution.' It is to be observed that to place the words of Institution before the Invocation does not necessarily imply that the consecration is made by them; for they may be read as an authority for a consecration which is to follow, or the consecration may be regarded as a continuous act extending throughout the service, as Mr. Hammond so truly remarks of the Sacrifice. But still, to centre the consecration in words and acts not only different from the ancient English Use, but coming before the words of Institution, is so serious a matter that we cannot but think that a liturgical precedent must have existed for it in some document possessing authority with its framers. And this is precisely what is furnished to us by Erasmus's translation of the Liturgy of St. Chrysostom.

The Greek of that liturgy was printed by Erasmus from a manuscript of the twelfth century, and in the matter of the consecration its most important passages read as follows in his Latin version at pp. 186, 189, and 190 of the Antwerp edition above described. Before the words of Institution:

'Idoneos nos redde ad inferenda tibi dona et sacrificia spiritalia pro nostris peccatis et populi ignorantibus, et dignos nos fac ut inveniamus gratiam in conspectu tuo, ut acceptabile fiat sacrificium nostrum et ut obumbret spiritus gratiæ tuæ bonus super nos et super proposita dona hæc et omnem populum tuum. . . . Nocte qua traditus est, magis autem seipsum tradidit pro mundi vita, accipiens panem in sanctis suis et immaculatis et incontaminatis manibus, gratias agens, benedicens, sanctificans, frangens, dedit sanctis suis discipulis et apostolis dicens Accipite, comedite, hoc est corpus meum quod pro vobis frangitur in remissionem peccatorum. Similiter postquam cœnatum est, accipiens calicem et benedicens dixit Bibite ex eo omnes, hic est sanguis meus Novi Testamenti qui pro vobis et multis effunditur in remissionem peccatorum. . . . (Surgens obsignat sacra dona et dicit) Et fac panem quidem hunc preciosum corpus Christi tui . . . (et in calice dicit) In calice vero hoc pretiosum sanguinem Christi tui, transmutans Spiritu tuo sancto.'

In the recensions of the Liturgy which have appeared in the works of St. Chrysostom since Savile's edition, the Invocation of the Holy Spirit after the words of Institution are

<sup>1</sup> *Op. cit.* p. 207 n.

far more distinct than in that of Erasmus. They run as follows:

'Rogamus precamur et obsecramus, mitte Spiritum Sanctum in nos et in hæc proposita dona. . . . Fac panem hunc preciosum corpus Christi tui . . . Quod autem in hoc calice est preciosus sanguis Christi tui . . . Immutans Spiritu tuo sancto.'<sup>1</sup>

Thus Father Gasquet's statement that in the Greek Liturgies the Invocation comes after the words of Institution is quite true of the later editions, but not of the edition of Erasmus. There it would be more correct to say that the Invocation comes before them. And we offer it as a theory which, taking all things into account, reaches high probability, that the form of consecration of the Eucharist in the English book of 1549 was framed on the basis of the passages just quoted from Erasmus's edition of the Liturgy of St. Chrysostom.

The motive of the change in the case of the consecration of the Holy Eucharist, as well as in the case of the Ordinal, was that of clinging closely and exactly to Scripture records and examples, on the principle that, among all the difficulties and disputes of the time, it must be safe to do what Christ did, and say what He said. This must be the sure way of appealing to Him for the grace of an ordinance which He instituted, and no authority of later time and inferior position can have any right to question the validity of acts done and of words spoken in the closest imitation of Him.

It would require larger space than that of an article to trace the moderating influence of Erasmus in the Anglican statements of doctrine in the sixteenth century. But we shall venture to state that friends or enemies of Lutheranism will search in vain for any statements upon justification corresponding to those above quoted from Luther, or to the words of the Confession of Augsburg, which pronounce men justified by God for Christ's sake when they believe that they are received into grace and that their sins are remitted for Christ's sake, who, by His death, made satisfaction for our sins.<sup>2</sup> In our eleventh Article justification by faith is treated as convertible into the statement that we are justified by Christ alone, which no Christian will deny; and although, in the Homily of Salvation, the influence of Lutheranism is more clearly apparent, yet there is the most evident repugnance to representing sacrifice for our sins as

<sup>1</sup> *S. Chrysostomi Op.* ed. Bened., Paris, 1839, xii. 1039.

<sup>2</sup> *Sylloge Confessionum*, Oxford, 1827, p. 124; see too p. 168.

the sole character in which faith apprehends the Saviour, or personal sense of forgiveness as the sole character of saving faith, or the act of faith as separable in man from the other characteristics of a holy life, or the business of justification as an exchange between God and us by which, on our acknowledgment of His all-sufficiency He endows us in return with His forgiveness. It is not possible to ignore these shrinkings of Anglicanism, even in the documents of its most Protestant period, from the extreme doctrines of Lutheran justification. And the influence of Erasmus, powerful as we know it to have been at the time, must be counted among the most probable causes of this result.

The tremendous excitements of the Reformation time produced an earlier and more pressing need in religious than in literary subjects to substitute the vernacular for Latin. Yet the 'Adagia' of Erasmus, or portions of it, were early rendered into English. They were a tempting source from which to draw a little volume for the use of English readers. But the rendering of the 'Paraphrases' into English, by Udall and others, which obtained so distinguished a recognition in the Church, preceded the complete translation of any of the author's secular works into the same language. In 1549 was published the *Praise of Folly* in English. That, indeed, also possessed some ecclesiastical reference, by reason of its satire upon the clergy and the friars.

The translator was a man of the time, and of great distinction—Sir Thomas Chaloner, an intimate friend of the Emperor Charles V., as well as of Lord Burghley. Readers of Froude's *History* will remember his exhortations from Brussels to Elizabeth, 'so only to trust the Spaniards as first and best to trust herself,' and his hope for himself, if England was armed and exercised, 'to toast a crab by the fire in his old days.' 'If I were God,' wrote he, 'I would swear by myself that I believe our trust is in God's defence only, and, by Him, in our foresight; so our professed enemies and faint friends, instead of cartels of defiance, will send us solemn letters of congratulation; otherwise *væ victis*.'<sup>1</sup> Sir Thomas did not obtain his wish to toast a crab by the fire in his old age, for the anxieties of an embassy to Spain, and the un-English diet and uncomfortable life of that country, brought him to an untimely end in 1565.<sup>2</sup> He was a specimen of the English public servant of the time; a religious man, but not with the religion either of Puritanism or Popery. We could

<sup>1</sup> Froude's *History of England*, cabinet ed. vi. 285, 313.

<sup>2</sup> *Ib.* viii. 45.

hardly expect that a patriotic Englishman of that date should accept the Pope's ecclesiastical authority while busy in opposing the secular influence by which the Pontiff and the princes in alliance with him threatened the existence of England. As little could we suppose him sympathising with the peevish insubordination of Puritanism. Chaloner was an excellent scholar, and left behind him his social theories in a Latin poem in ten books, *De Republicâ Angliæ Instaurandâ*, and a Panegyric in the same tongue upon Henry VIII. He belonged therefore to the time when Latin was still a living language for the educated ; while his English rendering of the *Praise of Folly* shows how its English rival was advancing. The latter work, when we have regard to its date, is not without interest in the history of English prose, and as the little quarto, badly printed and wild in its spelling, is very scarce, an extract will not displease the reader. Here is one which shows how Erasmus knew the ways of the gaming-table, the same in the sixteenth century as in our own, and passes on to the defects of the religious world :

‘ Moreover, these dyse plaiers, though I doubt whether their madnesse be foolishhe or furious, yet surely it is a foolish and ridiculous sight to beholde many of them so given to the plaie, that as soone as they but here ones the sounding of the dyse springing upon the boorde (Lorde) how by and by they herts beginne to lepe and throbbe in their belies. Further, through a certaine suckling hope of gayne, havyng made shipwrecke of all theyr good, when theyr shippe strikes upon the Dise rocke, a daunger farre more perillous than is the race of Britaine, themselves hardly escapyng in theyr hose and theyr doublet, yet sooner will they begyle theyr owne brother than him that nicked them of theyr money, lest els perchance they myght be counted foule gamesters. Yea, and beyng olde now and almost blynde, yet plaie they stil with glasen eies, and lastly, havyng theyr fingers so knobbed wyth the goute as rendreth them impotent, yet hyre they some other to cast the dise for them. In which kinde of madnesse (I wene) thei myghte passe theyr tymes right pleasantly if it did not for the most part burst into a rage, and so perteine rather to the Furies of hell than to Folie. But those men, no question, are wholy of my retinew that put theyr sole delyte in tellynge or hearynge of these feigned miracles or verilier monstrous lies, being never satisfied threrwith, as when they feigne certaine terrible tales of gostes, sprites, fayries, and divels, with thousande suche other old wyves’ inventions, which the further thei sounde from truth are the gladeier beleved and more pleasantly dooe fede men’s eares. For surely such fables are not onely doulcet to passe the tyme with all but gaynfull also to theyr practisers, such as pardoners and limittours be. Than agayne next neyghbours to these are such as have a foolysh but yet a pleasant perswasion to themselves



that what daie they see a graven image of Saint Barbara, with some praier preserved for that use, they cannot but retourne hurtelesse from the warres. Or if upon the Sondaies they woorshippe Saincte Erasmus with certaine tapers and Paternosters thei shal in short space become rich men. For what speake I of others who with feigned Perdones and remissions of sinnes dooe pleasantly flattre theihselves, takyng upon them to measure the space and continuance of soulls above in Purgatorie, as it were by houreghlasses setting out bothe the yeres, the monthes, the daies, the houres, and the leste minutes, without missyng, as if they had cast it by Algrysme : or what of those that under confidence of majike praiers and charmelyke Rosaries which some devoute deceivour invented fyrste, either for his pleasure or his profite, dooe promise themselves all gladde thynges, richnesse, honour, pleasure, good fare, long health, longer lyfe, greene age, yea, and the next seate in heaven to God Almightye, which seate yet by theyr willes they wolde not possesse to tymely. I meane that, when the pleasures of this life have left theym muche agaynst theyr willic ; yea, holdyng theym backe as it were by the teeth, than are thei at last content to have those heavenly joies succede in the others' places.'

The works of Erasmus never enjoyed in translations the extreme popularity which they had in the original Latin during the time when the widespread knowledge of that language, and the immature condition of the native tongues, secured him a reading public. At that time the circulation of his works numbered hundreds of thousands of copies, and equalled that of the most popular moderns, even if we include the novelists. But even after the change of language the works of Erasmus never fell into the pit of darkness which has swallowed so many popular writers of every generation. Innumerable pocket editions of his minor devotional works were brought out in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries — the *Enchiridion*, the *Methodus Veræ Theologiæ*, the *Precatio Dominica*, the *Symboli Explicatio*, the *Præparatio ad Mortem*. We have before us the *Moriæ Encomium*, printed at Oxford, 1668 ; the *Enchiridion* at Cambridge, 1685 ; a translation of the *De Contemptu Mundi*, Paris, 1713 (on the title-page of which Cantbrige appears as the French equivalent for Cantabrigia) ; and *Colloquia Familiaria*, printed in Dublin, 1722, 'ad usum Juventutis Politioris Humanitatis studiis imbuendæ apud omnes Protestantes Britannos præsertim et Hibernos,' the venture of a schoolmaster evidently, for school purposes and self-advertisement, and with dedications to Archbishop King, the Bishop of Clogher, Sir Thomas Coote, and Mr. Molyneux. Wherever books were printed at all in Europe in the two centuries after his death, there some of those of

Erasmus were sure to appear. That is popularity such as falls to very few among the workers with the pen.

What part Erasmus would have taken if he had lived into the controversies of the generations after Luther we cannot be sure. It is idle to take for granted that the saints and scholars of past ages could certainly have agreed with us if they had lived to our time; on the other hand, it is not wise to be sure that they would have retained the position which they held in their lifetime, no matter what changes of opinion it should require of them. No doubt Erasmus would have viewed with admiration not unmingled with criticism, the counter-Reformation, and the wonderful work of the Jesuits. But it is beyond dispute that the definitions of the Council of Trent, and the doctrinal developments of later times, would have required of him views of papal authority very different from the conservative dislike to change things established, or lend his hand to schism, which sufficed to retain him in the papal ranks of his time. Great as are the merits of Professor Froude and Mr. Drummond, we cannot but regret that the biography of this great ecclesiastic should have fallen into the hands of writers who view the development of Catholic doctrine with so little sympathy. We do not deny that there is in the letters of Erasmus a certain element which lends itself to the light treatment of Catholic theology which such biographers must needs approve. The Horatian vein in his literary style might easily persuade us that he himself was a self-indulgent *dilettante*, if the amount of his production did not remind us what an indefatigable labourer he was; and the subjects on which he spent his toil bear plain testimony that the contents of the Catholic tradition afforded to him the chief objects of his faith and affection. The friends whose characters he has drawn with inimitable power were men of earnest and orthodox religion; and it is some one like-minded with them that could best draw the portrait of Erasmus. Should such a biographer appear, he will not suppose that the influence of the Reformer over the English Reformation stopped short with the deaths of Colet, Fisher, and More. It will not seem to him too much to maintain that the reformed Catholicism of our land is the sphere in which the searching yet cautious spirit of Erasmus is most active to-day, filled with a practical courage and determination which adverse circumstances and constitutional weakness denied to him. Could he visit the scene of his labours at Cambridge, he would find a work of sacred scholarship in progress so earnest and so fruitful that the learned world

could scarcely offer anything more to his mind. And we must not be blamed if we feel some assurance that Erasmus could hardly now find a Church more congenial to his Catholicity, more absolute in the liberty which it permits to men of learning, than the Church of England, in the development of which he had no small share, and which is still faithful to the traditions he delivered.

---



---

### ART. III.—ARCHBISHOP LAUD.

1. *The Works of Archbishop Laud.* 'Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology.' (Oxford, 1853, &c.)
2. *Breviate of the Life of Laud.* *Hidden Workes of Darknesse brought to Public Light. Canterburie's Doome.* By WILLIAM PRYNNE (1644-6).
3. *Cyprianus Anglicus: or, The Life and Death of Archbishop Laud.* By PETER HEYLYN (1671).
4. *Life of Archbishop Laud.* By CHARLES WEBB LE BAS. (London, 1836.)
5. *Essays, Historical and Theological.* By J. B. MOZLEY. Vol. I. (London, 1845.)
6. *The Life of William Laud, Archbishop of Canterbury, and Martyr.* By J. BAINES. (London, 1855.)
7. *Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury.* By W. F. HOOK. Vol. XI. (London, 1875.)
8. *William Laud, sometime Archbishop of Canterbury; a Study.* By A. C. BENSON. (London, 1887.)
9. *A Life of Archbishop Laud.* By 'A ROMISH RECUSANT.' (London, 1894.)
10. *Life and Times of William Laud, Archbishop of Canterbury.* By C. H. SIMPKINSON. (London, 1894.)
11. *William Laud.* By W. H. HUTTON. (London, 1895.)
12. *Waymarks in Church History.* By W. BRIGHT. (London, 1894.)
13. *The Church and the Puritans.* By H. O. WAKEMAN. (London, 1887.)
14. *Student's English Church History.* By G. G. PERRY. Second Period. (London, 1887.)
15. *The Romanes Lecture, 1892: an Academic Sketch.* By W. E. GLADSTONE. (Oxford, 1892.)
16. *The Laud Commemoration Lectures.* By the BISHOP OF PETERBOROUGH, Professor MARGOLIOUTH, Professor COLLINS, the Revs. W. H. HUTTON and C. H. SIMPKINSON. Reports in the *Guardian*, 1895.

## PART I.

OF all branches of literature none has made greater progress during the last fifty years than that of history. There are other departments in which improvement is not discernible. He would be a bold man who should argue that we have among us better poets than Tennyson and Browning, Keble and Wordsworth; or better novelists than Thackeray and Dickens. But in history we certainly have improved. Fresh sources of knowledge have been opened out or rendered more generally accessible; passion and prejudice have to some extent succumbed to an honest and sincere desire to discover the truth, whithersoever it may lead us. With this increased knowledge of history has come a better appreciation of historic Christianity; and, to come to our immediate subject, this has certainly led to a higher estimate of that man who, in his day, was above all things the staunch and uncompromising champion of historic Christianity, as against all innovations on the right hand or on the left—William Laud.

Laud has of course always had his admirers in the English Church, from Peter Heylin downwards; but the *general* student of history would, we think, have formed on the whole an unfavourable opinion of him until quite recent years. An amusing instance of this occurred at Oxford about sixty years ago. Oxford, before it became liberalized, was always a staunch supporter of its great benefactor, and one of its colleges gave as a subject for a prize essay, 'Laudii Laudes.' A more than ordinarily conscientious undergraduate, who proposed to compete, determined first to investigate every source of information to which he could find access; and the conclusion he arrived at was, that if the subject had been 'Laudii Vituperia' he could have written much, but on 'Laudii Laudes' there was very little to be said.

The conclusion was really not an unnatural one, as we shall see if we cast a rapid glance at some of the principal estimates of Laud, which were taken, say, before the middle of the nineteenth century.

We begin with Laud's own *Diary*. Thanks to Archbishop Sancroft and his industrious chaplain, Henry Wharton, we have, and the undergraduate of sixty years ago might have had, the original article, purged from the shameful mutilations and interpolations of William Prynne. But, after all, the *Diary* gives us no fair or adequate idea of what Laud was. It was never intended for the public eye; it was simply the record of the casual thoughts of the moment, jotted down

just as they occurred. What man in the world could bear to be judged by such a standard? Then, again, it appeared just when the age of 'Diaries' was, as it were, setting in—of diaries which were intended to be published, or, at any rate, in which the idea of publication was contemplated. What a poor figure such an unstudied record must have cut when compared with diaries like those of John Evelyn, Ralph Thoresby, Denis Granville, and a hundred others! Once more, Laud wrote just before the new light of science, which he himself did so much to foster, had been shed. The Royal Society had not yet been, but was just on the eve of being, founded; the Baconian philosophy had not yet had time to make its influence generally felt, as it did very soon after. In short, Laud lived at the close of the pre-scientific age, and it is an anachronism to judge him by the scientific standard. It is easy enough for British Philistinism, of which that very superior person, Lord Macaulay, is the incarnation, to make merry over Laud's dreams and omens and conjunctions of planets; but the proceeding is about as reasonable as if one who had been accustomed to the Maxim guns were to make merry over those who used the bow and arrows with such deadly execution on the field of Senlac. Laud's *History of his Troubles and Tryal* does not touch the point, for it was his life, not his departure from life, that wanted vindicating; those who condemned most emphatically his life and policy still sympathized with his fate and thought that he was cruelly dealt with.

The first biographies of Laud were written by his bitterest and most relentless enemy. The *Breviate of the Life of Laud* (1644) was taken almost verbatim from his *Diary*. *Hidden Workes of Darknesse brought to Public Light*, and *Canterburie's Doome* (1646), by William Prynne, paint Laud in the blackest colours, without any relief whatever. Then came *Cyprianus Anglicus: or, The Life and Death of Archbishop Laud*, by his devoted admirer and chaplain, Peter Heylin. Next to Laud's own works this is still the most interesting part of the Laudian literature to the Laudian student; but we doubt whether it was ever likely to prove a triumphant vindication of Laud to the general public. In the first place, it is too long and too full of the worthy Heylin's reflections upon things in general and himself in particular. Again, it is on the face of it an *ex parte* statement. It is like a picture of the pious Æneas drawn by the faithful Achates; it is Robinson Crusoe as he appeared to the man Friday. The reader would naturally want to know what other people thought who did

not, like Heylin, owe so much to the hero of the biography. How, then, is Laud represented in the magnificent portrait gallery in Clarendon's *History of the Rebellion*? Clarendon was a Churchman and a Royalist; surely he is not likely to be too hard upon Laud, who was, moreover, his early benefactor. But Clarendon's portrait is, to say the least of it, a blending of lights and shades, the shades being decidedly predominant. He duly brings out the piety, the honesty, and the consistency of the man; but he also brings out in full relief his roughness, his harshness, his injudiciousness; and he more than hints that these were among the chief causes of the disasters which befell the Church and the Monarchy.

If Laud fares thus doubtfully in the pages of the great Royalist historian, there is no doubt whatever about the estimate which Bishop Burnet takes of him in his *History of My Own Times*. Burnet and Laud were in every respect the antipodes of one another. Laud was a high-churchman, Burnet a low; Laud was a main supporter of the Stuart dynasty, Burnet of the dynasty which overthrew the Stuarts; Laud was the upholder of the divine right of kings and of the royal prerogative, Burnet of the parliamentary title of kings and of the supremacy of Parliament; Laud was the patron of learning, Burnet of busy work which left little time for learning. In fact, Laud and Burnet could as little coalesce as oil and vinegar; so it is no wonder that Burnet has nothing to say in praise, and much in dispraise, of Laud. Nor can we expect it to be otherwise with that foreigner who, oddly enough, was the first to write a complete *History of England up to the Death of Charles I.* Rapin was brought over to England by William III., and would of course reflect in his history the views of his patron; those views were diametrically opposite to the principles which governed Laud all his life long; so Laud naturally suffers much depreciation in the pages of Rapin. A far greater historian, David Hume, might, as a Tory and a defender of the Stuarts, be expected to view Laud in a more favourable light. But it is not so. Laud, to his credit be it said, was too religious-minded a man to please Hume, who can see nothing but childish superstition, formalism, and pedantry in Laud's religion, and appears glad to find a scape-goat in the Archbishop for the errors of the King. To the historian of the Puritans, Daniel Neal, Laud is of course an object of special abhorrence. Taking Prynne's account as if it were gospel, Neal represents Laud as if he were nothing more than a cruel persecutor of Nonconformists, and a Papist in disguise. A similar view is taken by a once



very popular historian, Mrs. Catherine Macaulay, who, as a Radical and a hater of the clergy, condemns Laud emphatically. Of course Laud found his defenders among his own order; but these were not sufficient to turn the tide, which ran strongly in his disfavour all through the eighteenth century. The tale was taken up by the two most popular historians in the earlier half of the nineteenth. Hallam, in his cold, cautious way, and Macaulay, in his rushing, impetuous fashion, have both attacked Laud vehemently; and we are inclined to think that a vast number of Englishmen take their ideas of Laud simply from these two writers. But it is to be hoped that the public is now beginning to see that in this, as in many other matters, there is another side as well as that taken by Hallam and Macaulay. At any rate, it has a chance of doing so. For partly, but by no means entirely, owing to the Oxford Movement, a reaction has set in, and we have had numberless estimates of Laud, of varying merit and interest, but all doing more justice to him than had been done in earlier generations.

First came a *Life of Archbishop Laud*, by Mr. Charles Webb Le Bas, in 1836. This was part of a series called 'The Theological Library,' edited by H. J. Rose and W. R. Lyall. Mr. Le Bas had previously written *Lives of Wiclif* (1831), *Cranmer* (1833), and *Jewell* (1835) for the same series. In all four Mr. Le Bas is most fair and discriminating, duly recording the faults as well as the merits of his heroes; but all four *are* his heroes, and one cannot but feel that if Laud were right the other three were more or less wrong, and *vice versa*. The *Lives* were written for a purpose, viz. to commend the old-fashioned high-churchmanship, as high-churchmanship was before the Oxford Movement; and this was not quite Laud's attitude. So he suffers a little from the point of view from which he is regarded, but still Mr. Le Bas did excellent service by his contribution to the Laudian literature. The next *Life* came nearer the mark, though it appears to have fallen into unmerited oblivion. It is *The Life of William Laud, Archbishop of Canterbury and Martyr*, by the Rev. J. Baines, a member of Laud's own college, St. John's. It was published in 1855, and was also part of a series. But the company in which Laud now finds himself (Nicholas Ferrar, James Bonnell, Saint Boniface, &c.) is a more congenial one than that in which Mr. Le Bas placed him, and the stand-point from which he is regarded just marks the difference between the high-churchman before and after the Oxford Movement. In the interval between the two biographies (that is, in 1845) appeared

Mr. J. B. Mozley's brilliant essay on Laud, which has been a *locus classicus* on the subject ever since. In 1876 the longest Life of Laud since that of Heylin was published. There is a melancholy interest about the last volume<sup>1</sup> of Dean Hook's *Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury*, by far the larger part of which is occupied by Laud. It must have been written by a virtually dying man, and was only sent to the press just before his death. There is something heroic in the grand old man, after a life of ceaseless and splendidly successful devotion to the practical work of the Church, spending his declining days in his great literary work, and actually dying in harness so far as literature went. But sentiment must not blind us to the truth. Dean Hook was an amateur, not a professional, in the field of history. Whatever period he is writing about, he always seems to have one eye steadily fixed on the second half of the nineteenth century. By temperament and training he was not quite fitted to treat Laud satisfactorily; he is too narrow and too modern in his view. We are thankful for his Life of Laud as a testimony from an able man of noble character to the merits of the Archbishop; but that is all.

It is, however, in the domain of general history rather than in the professed biographies of Laud that the change of tone is especially noticeable. And, strangely enough, the turn of the tide is first marked in the writings of one who was not only a foreigner but a German Lutheran, and who cannot therefore be supposed to have had any prejudices in favour of Laud's distinctive Church views.

Via prima salutis,  
Quod minime reris, Graia pandetur ab urbe.

It was simply as an honest searcher after truth that Leopold von Ranke came to a more favourable conclusion about the character of Laud than Hallam and Macaulay had drawn. Oxford did yeoman's service to the cause of historical truth, no less than to the cause of the English Church, when she put forth in 1875 a readable translation of Ranke's *History of England, principally in the Seventeenth Century*. It was by far the best history of the period that had then appeared, and gave a just account of the Archbishop. But England has redeemed her credit by producing since that time a native historian, who is far more full and accurate than any of his predecessors, and who has really treated the Stuart period exhaustively; it is hardly necessary to add that his name is Samuel Rawson Gardiner. He again, like Ranke, is led to do justice

<sup>1</sup> That is vol. xi.; vol. xii. is occupied with the index.

to Laud rather from his desire to ascertain the truth and from his thorough knowledge of the subject than from his Church views. This fact renders the testimony of both writers all the more valuable and significant. The example has been followed in quarters from which we should have least expected it. Dr. Stoughton, that fairest of all Nonconformist historians, belongs to the same religious body to which Dr. Neal, the historian of the Puritans, belonged. But what a difference there is in the tone of the two Congregational writers in their treatment of Laud! While the earlier can find nothing but what is bad in him, the later can own that he was an extraordinary man, of wonderful activity, whose capacities for work were of gigantic magnitude, and to whose abilities his enemies have not done justice.

The year 1887 saw a curious contribution to Laudian literature entitled *William Laud, sometime Archbishop of Canterbury; a Study*, by A. C. Benson. Mr. Benson, inspired, as he implies, by the atmosphere and associations of Lambeth, felt it to be his mission to give the public a 'Study' of his father's predecessor. It is written quite in the *fin de siècle* style, and often tempts one to cry 'Alas, poor Yorick!'—but at any rate its tone is far more kindly than that of Hallam or Macaulay. As, however, Mr. Benson has subsequently found a more congenial occupation in studying the habits of doubtful *Dodos* and other *Details of the Day*, he would hardly thank us, perhaps, for calling attention to his youthful performance.

But within the last year or so there have been no less than three distinct Lives of Laud, all written from different points of view. We hope that we are not biassed by theological prejudices in saying that the one written from our own point of view is incomparably the best in every way. Regarded simply as a composition, the difference between Mr. Hutton's 'Life' and those of the other two is too manifest to escape the most superficial reader. Both in style and matter it is the work of a practised *littérateur*: the scholar, the gentleman, the Christian, the sound churchman is conspicuous in every page; and, what is most important in dealing with Laud (who was certainly one of those men who are apt to rouse people's passions and carry them out of the region of sober judgment), Mr. Hutton exercises a severe self-restraint, and never reminds us of Phaethon mounting the chariot of the Sun. Moreover, he is not only an Oxford man, but a distinguished resident fellow of Laud's own college. He is inspired with the *genius loci* in an eminent

degree; he is permeated with Oxford ideas through and through, without which a man is hardly capable of understanding Laud; and in a thousand little details he shows minute accuracy where, alas! we have been only too used to find inaccuracy. In short, if a bewildered reader, or a busy man for whom life is too short to wade through all the mass of literature, good, bad, and indifferent, and to balance the conflicting accounts—this one representing Laud as a fiend incarnate, for whom decapitation was an inadequate punishment; that one, as an immaculate, if somewhat vapid, martyr for whom canonization would be an inadequate reward—were to ask where he could find the truth briefly told, we should reply, 'Read Mr. Hutton: mark, learn, and inwardly digest what he says; and you will gain a truer view of Laud than if you puzzled your brain with all the conflicting accounts and estimates with which the public has been favoured.' But those two words 'briefly told' indicate a grievance which we have against Mr. Hutton, or, rather, against the editor of the excellent series of 'Leaders of Religion,' in which the work appears. It is useless to contend against the law of supply and demand; if the public desires to take its biographies, as it takes its medicine, in homœopathic doses—why, the public must be supplied. But when a long and full Life of a man is a real want, we do protest against securing a writer who is eminently qualified to supply that want to write a short 'Life.' The process might be reversed with great advantage. The man who has written the long 'Life' well may be safely trusted to condense it into a short one, as Professor Fraser has done so admirably in the case of Bishop Berkeley; but we know no instance of a short 'Life' being expanded into a long one. Now there are two men who deserve and require long and exhaustive biographies—John Keble and William Laud—and there are two men who are thoroughly competent to write them—Mr. Lock and Mr. Hutton. But Mr. Beeching, wise in his generation, has pounced upon them both to write short biographies for his excellent series, and we fear the long ones will never follow. Nearly two years ago we entreated Mr. Lock in these pages to set about the task of expanding his 'Keble,' but we fear he has turned a deaf ear to our entreaties. We now entreat Mr. Hutton to expand his 'Laud.' There are many points which we should like to see more fully treated: notably, Laud's amazing want of perception of the direction in which matters both in Church and State were drifting, the causes of his intense unpopularity, the exact part which he took in the

proceedings of the Star Chamber and the High Commission Court, and his relations with Buckingham.

And now we must turn to the other two recent biographies, both of which, though inferior in workmanship to Mr. Hutton's, have a certain value which, from the nature of the case, Mr. Hutton's cannot possess; for Mr. Hutton is, we imagine, a Laudian, while the other writers are not; so their estimate has an independent value without any suspicion of partisanship. Of Mr. Simpkinson's *Life and Times of William Laud, Archbishop of Canterbury*, it is enough to say that it is an honest attempt to vindicate the Archbishop from unjust charges by one who evidently does not share all Laud's views; but of *A Life of Archbishop Laud*, by 'A Romish Recusant,' somewhat more must be said. In the first place, Why does the writer call himself a 'Romish Recusant'? There *is* no such being in existence. The expression has a definite historical signification. It means a man who has been required by law to attend his parish church, and has refused to do so. But the penal laws have been abolished, or fallen into disuse; and, without having the least suspicion who the 'Romish Recusant' is, we are bold to say that he is *not* a 'Romish Recusant,' for he has *not* been required to attend his parish church, and has *not* refused (*recusavit*) to do so. Does he call himself so because he has hazy ideas as to what the term meant? The matter of his book intimates that this is not an uncharitable assumption, for accuracy is not his *forte*. Not once, but over and over again, so that it cannot be a printer's error, he calls Prynne's book '*Histrio-matrix*' (pp. 201, 203, 485, &c.), a word which sets a Greek scholar's teeth on edge, for '*mastix*' (a scourge) is one of the commonest Greek words. He always speaks of 'Cyprianus Anglicanus' (as, by the way, does Mr. Simpkinson), though 'Cyprianus Anglicus' stares one in the face in black and white, or rather red and white, on the title-page of Heylin's book. He does not seem to know the difference between a prebendary and a prebend, for he tells us that Bishop Neile 'gave Laud the Prebendary of Bugden' (p. 54), that the Archbishop of Spalatro was made 'a Prebend of Canterbury' (p. 61), that 'Dr. Cozens [*sic*] was a Prebend of Durham.' We may, perhaps, expect to find a Roman Catholic speaking of 'the very founder of the Church of England as by law established' [Henry VIII.] (p. 15), of 'the newly-made Church of England' (p. 16), 'the new Anglican Establishment' (p. 21), and so on *da capo*; but this does not make the expressions historically accurate. A few elegant

extracts will give the reader an idea of his charitableness, his reverence, and his good taste :

'Like not a few modern High-Church Anglicans, he [Laud] just a little over-reached himself in his endeavours to be popish ; for, after his own fashion, he "consecrated" it [his chapel at Aberguilly]. Even his hagiographer, Heylin, writes that "it was objected that neither Gratian, nor the Roman Pontifical, conceive such Consecrations necessary to a Private Chappel." To be stormed at by Puritans, and to be stormed at by Catholics, for this performance must have been very trying to the temper of the High-Church bishop in his attempts to be ultra-orthodox' (p. 115). . . . 'The going through this performance [the consecration of St. Catherine Cree's] on the part of Laud, was surely very like "playing at church" ; for it was quite unauthorized by his own religious body' (p. 156). . . . 'When two or three were gathered together in God's name, to worship in an unconformable manner, there would he [Laud], in the person of his pursuivant, be in the midst of them.' [We almost shrink from quoting the passage, remembering Whose Words it parodies.] 'By-and-bye, Laud could not resist the opportunity of showing himself off. He must needs become historical, biblical, and classical at poor Williams's expense' (p. 302). . . . 'A party of stalwart women soon had him in their close embraces, and carrying their Right Reverend Father in God down his own staircase, they took him through the door and delivered him to the crowd of she-saints waiting in the street, who rolled him in the muddy gutter' (p. 316). . . . 'Laud, as usual on such occasions, expresses his thankfulness for the patience which God gave him during this trying scene ; as usual, too, it reads rather like a veiled piece of self-praise' (p. 408). . . . 'The little old man [Laud], still rather lame, hobbled to the bar of the House of Lords,' &c. (p. 428). . . . 'Poor old fellow [Laud] ! he walked with great courage up to the forbidding structure [the scaffold]' (p. 460). . . . 'Perhaps, in his prayer, we cannot altogether defend Laud from what is vulgarly called "playing to the gallery," when he beseeches God to give repentance "to all blood-thirsty people," and, if they will repent, "to confound all their desires" and "defeat and frustrate all their designs and endeavours" ; and, again, when he prays for "this distracted and distressed people," and tells his Maker confidentially that he is not guilty of treason. All this was carefully written out beforehand, and was probably intended partly for God and partly for the mob' (p. 468).

These extracts will suffice to show the tone of the book. It is satisfactory to notice that the writer never loses an opportunity of expressing his dislike and contempt for those whom he oddly calls 'High-Church Anglicans' ; for we take this to mean that their position is least assailable (as it certainly is) by Rome ; also that he utterly repudiates the idea that Laud was at all 'popishly inclined,' in which we entirely agree with him ; and finally that he admits Laud to have



been an honest man, though he is in grave doubts about his eternal destiny (p. 471, &c.).

Besides these professed biographies, there have also been of late years several scattered notices of Laud, written by men of a much higher intellectual calibre than any of the biographers, with the exception, perhaps, of Mr. Hutton. Mr. Offley Wakeman's account of Laud in 'The Church and the Puritans' is one of the best parts in one of the best volumes of that excellent series, *Epochs of Church History*. Nowhere does Archdeacon Perry show more conspicuously that fairness, outspokenness, discrimination, and accuracy which render his *Church History* so valuable a contribution to the department of literature than in his chapters on Laud; and Canon Bright's essay on Laud, in his *Waymarks in Church History*, is a perfect little gem, showing an all-round knowledge of the whole subject, and condensing it without losing that vivid interest which he knows so well how to impart to all his writings, in a way which none but a real Laudian student can fully appreciate. We have hinted that Mr. Hutton might well undertake a larger Life of Laud; but it would be still better if Canon Bright would undertake the task. There is a special value, both in Archdeacon Perry's and Canon Bright's account, because both boldly deal, in a way which none of the friendly biographers do, with the real defects of Laud, while at the same time they are in full sympathy with his Churchmanship, and do justice to the services which he rendered to the Church. Last, but not least, Mr. Gladstone, in his *Romanes Lecture* of 1892, brings out in a vivid light one aspect of Laud's theology which is apt to be lost sight of—its tolerance. Is it an accident, or has it something to do with the genius of the place, that all the best accounts of Laud—indeed, all those which have any real and permanent value, have been written by Oxford men, who have all been closely connected, in one way or another, with the University system?

Of the 'Laud Commemoration Lectures' we have as yet (March 1895) only the newspaper reports, but before the next part of this article appears it is hoped that the promised volume, which will contain them all *in extenso*, will have been published; it will be better, therefore, to postpone any notice of them at present.

We may now turn from his biographers and critics to the man himself. The keynote to Laud's object is intimated, though not directly expressed, in the very first sentence of the Introduction to the *Cyprianus Anglicus*: 'Before we come,' begins

Heylin, 'to the history of this famous prelate it will not be amiss to see upon what principle and position the reformation of this Church did first proceed'; and three pages later, 'Nothing that was *Apostolick*, or accounted Primitive, did fare worse for being Popish; I mean for having been made use of in times of Popery; it being none of their designs to create a new Church, but to reform the old' (p. 4). Here we have the gist of the whole matter. The object of Laud was to restore the Church to what it was intended to be when the Reformation was first taken in hand. When England, after several more or less futile endeavours, extending over many years, finally broke off from the Roman obedience in 1634, the position she took was as plain as language could make it. It is admirably stated by Starkey in his 'Reply' to Cardinal Pole's *Defence of Church Unity*:

'Herein lies the sense of your book; because we are slipped from the obedience of Rome, you judge us to be separate from the Unity of the Church, and to be no members of the Catholic body. Weigh this cause yet a little, Master Pole; and despise not the consent of your country, and of all the learned men therein, with too much arrogance. Though we be slipt from the obedience of Rome, yet we be not slipt *a fide Romanâ nec a Petri Cathedrâ*. We observe and keep the same faith which from the beginning hath been taught at Rome.'

Some years later Dean Field takes up the same tale: 'At the Reformation we separated from a part which claimed to be the whole, that we might hold with the Church Catholic against the pretensions of the Church of Rome.'

This was theory; but in practice it had become far otherwise. Partly through the influence of foreign reformers, partly through the spread of a Puritanism of native growth, the Reformed Church was fast drifting away from its first moorings. It was not only being attacked from without, but, what was far worse, it was being undermined from within; and the man who above all others restored it to its first love, thereby bringing about his own ruin and the temporary ruin of the Church as a national institution, was William Laud. He was greatly aided in his task by the revived study of history, and especially of the Early Fathers, which marked the close of the sixteenth and the beginning of the seven-

<sup>1</sup> Quoted by Canon Dixon in his *History of the Church of England from the Abolition of the Papal Jurisdiction*, i. 442. It must be remembered that Starkey wrote before the Council of Trent had stereotyped doctrines, and had made articles of faith what were not *de fide* before.

teen  
no  
as f  
and  
the  
it w  
Lau  
his  
earl  
day  
of t  
160  
and  
Fath  
if he  
from  
was  
quit  
chap  
coun  
had  
Lan  
foun  
posi  
spec  
ciple  
led t  
their  
whic  
perf  
and  
quan  
he a  
time  
agai  
a do  
his p  
So f  
com  
more  
in us  
further  
truth  
tactic  
on c

teenth century. His views were not original, and certainly not innovations. They were only what had been held quite as firmly by Hooker, and Bilson, and Bancroft, and Young, and Buckeridge, and Andrewes, and countless others; and the last two were probably his first instructors. At any rate, it was Buckeridge and Andrewes who influenced Laud, not Laud who influenced them. Andrewes he always took for his 'guide, philosopher, and friend.' Buckeridge directed his early theological studies, which were so remarkable for those days that Dr. Young, Bishop of Rochester, who in the vacancy of the see of Oxford ordained him both deacon and priest in 1601, said that he 'found his studies raised above the system and opinions of the age upon the noble foundations of the Fathers, councils, and ecclesiastical histories, and presaged that, if he lived, he would be an instrument in restoring the Church from the private principles of modern times.' The presage was abundantly verified by the event, though not, perhaps, quite in the way that the good Bishop, who made Laud his chaplain in 1608, expected. It was not that Laud had the courage of his opinions, while others who agreed with him had not. There was no mistaking, for instance, what was Lancelot Andrewes's attitude from first to last. And Laud found Buckeridge at Oxford manfully holding the same position, and rallying a small party round him. But the speciality of Laud was that he persistently pushed his principles until they became a real power; took measures which led to their adoption, and to the removal of the hindrances in their way; saw the real tendency of opinions and practices which were apparently innocuous or unimportant. He was perfectly alive to the antagonism between his own theory and that of Rome; and when he saw real danger from that quarter was ready to meet it, and to suffer for meeting it, as he actually did. But he perceived that at that particular time the peril to the Church lay on the side of Puritanism, against which he waged a lifelong war. He tracked it with a dogged persistency into all its ramifications, and used all his powers to stamp it out. Those powers were very great. So far as Church matters were concerned he acquired a complete control over the king, and, what was perhaps of more importance, over the favourite. He had no hesitation in using the secular power to the utmost possible extent to further his end. It is surely a strange perversion of the truth to say, as has often been said, that he made a sort of tacit bargain with the Crown to magnify the royal prerogative, on condition that it should be used to serve the interests of

the Church.<sup>1</sup> Rather, he regarded the monarchy itself as a Divine institution, as sacred in its way as the episcopate itself, and really believed that it was the highest duty of God's vicegerent to help and defend the Church of God. His system has frequently been called Erastian; but it was a sort of inverted Erastianism. The (so-called) secular power was to have the most absolute control; but its office was to exalt the Church above the State, not the State above the Church. He was prepared to ride roughshod over every obstacle in his way to the end at which he aimed, and he certainly did not always combine the *suaviter in modo* with the *fortiter in re*. He had an ungracious manner, 'had no time for compliments,' as he told young Edward Hyde, afterwards Lord Clarendon, who rather audaciously played the part of a good-natured friend to a man five-and-thirty years his senior, telling him frankly of his faults and his increasing unpopularity; and he often gave offence without intending to do so. But it was not merely his manner that offended. The Puritans knew their enemy; *their* system and *his* system could not coexist. So they opposed him, as he opposed them, tooth and nail. And as England was then honeycombed with Puritanism, it is no wonder that he incurred a virulent and general odium, which could only be satisfied when it had brought him to the block. But he carried his point, though at the cost of his own life. He left the Church, though apparently ruined mainly by his action, in reality a far stronger power than he had found it. The Church of the Elizabethan era was uninteresting, and called forth no enthusiasm;<sup>2</sup> the Church of the Stuart period was interesting in the highest degree, a society which awakened such enthusiastic attachment that men thought it worth living for—ay, and dying for; and the man who of all others brought about the change was William Laud.

In the face of the numerous biographies, sketches, essays, articles which have dealt with Laud, it may seem a work of supererogation to give ever so brief an account of his life; but it is necessary to do so, in order that we may have a peg on which to hang our remarks.

<sup>1</sup> The writer observes, since he wrote the above, that Professor Collins makes a similar remark in his lecture on 'Laud as a Statesman' in the 'Laud Commemoration Lectures.' See the *Guardian*, January 23, 1895.

<sup>2</sup> 'It is well,' says the Bishop of Peterborough, in the first Laud Commemoration Lecture, 'to abandon all illusions about the sixteenth century. There were strong men, there were powerful minds; but there was a dearth of beautiful characters.'

William Laud was born in 1573 at Reading, where his father was a clothier. His humble origin was often cast in his teeth when he was living, and dwelt upon as a reproach to him after his death. 'Libel after libel,' said Laud himself, 'raked me out of the dunghill.' W. Prynne's first accusation against him was that 'he was born of poor and obscure parents in a cottage.' But surely it was not unprecedented, nor, indeed, at all extraordinary for the son of an eminently respectable and substantial tradesman to rise to the highest offices of the Church. Laud's own friend and patron, Dr. Neile, who rose to be Archbishop of York, was the son of a tallow-chandler, Bishop Taylor (of Lincoln) was the 'son of a poor tailor in Cat Street, Oxford,' and a greater Bishop Taylor (Jeremy) was the son of a Cambridge barber. Becket probably, Wolsey certainly, was of no higher origin than Laud, and fifty years after Laud's death there was another occupant of Augustine's chair who was precisely of the same rank, for Archbishop Tillotson was also the son of a clothier.

After having received a good education at Reading Free (Grammar) School, Laud went in 1589 to Oxford, the place which, of all others, he loved best, and which still bears the traces of his munificence and of his organizing powers. It was at Oxford that his mind was formed. Successively commoner, scholar, fellow, 'grammar reader' (tutor), and President of St. John's College, and Proctor, Vice-Chancellor, and Chancellor of the University, he knew Oxford in all its phases. It was there that he learnt his Church principles under Buckeridge, there that he had his first experience of Puritan sourness under Abbot, there that he acquired that somewhat prim, stiff, formal manner, and perhaps also some of that arbitrariness, which made him to the end of his days the College Don. Laud was a type of man who is likely to make strong and lasting friends, and also strong and lasting enemies. While he was yet a young fellow of St. John's he had already found a life-long friend in Dr. Neile, afterwards successively Bishop of Rochester, Lincoln, Lichfield and Coventry, Durham, Winchester, and finally Archbishop of York, and a life-long enemy in Dr. Abbot, then Master of University College, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury. Puritanism had permeated through England in Laud's early days, but it had gathered into a focus at Oxford. The authorities were Calvinistic and Puritanical almost to a man. Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, the great patron of Puritans, though far from practising Puritan austerities himself, was for many years Chancellor of the University up to the time of his death,

which occurred the year before Laud went up as an undergraduate. Lord Buckhurst, afterwards Earl of Dorset, the Chancellor in Laud's day, was of the same party. So were both the Regius and the Margaret Professors of Divinity, the former, Dr. Lawrence Humphrey, President of Magdalen, being a very influential man; thus the two chairs from which theology was taught both spake the same tongue. As if this were not enough, a new lectureship was founded for the express purpose of teaching Puritanism, chiefly through the efforts of Walsingham, who, like most of Elizabeth's advisers, leaned towards the Puritans. It was held by the most noted preacher and one of the ablest and saintliest men at Oxford, Dr. Rainolds, President of Corpus Christi College, who was a Puritan of the first water. So were the two Abbots, Robert, the elder brother, who returned to Oxford in 1609 as Master of Balliol, and George, the younger, who was elected Master of University in 1597, and held that office until 1610; so was Dr. Airay, Provost of Queen's from 1598 to 1616, and Vice-Chancellor in 1606, when he came into collision with Laud. In short, Laud found himself in a nest of hornets, and very characteristically he acted in a way that was sure to provoke them to sting him. He had formed his opinions, and he took every opportunity of publishing them. In direct opposition to the Puritan theory, he maintained in 1603, in some divinity lectures at St. John's, that the English Church 'traced its orders and genealogy, through the Roman Catholic hierarchy up to the Apostles and the primitive Church' (Mozley), to the great offence especially of Dr. George Abbot, who held that the English Church traced her descent through the Albigenses, Hussites, and Wiclifites, and in later years wrote a treatise in favour of this theory. In his exercise for his B.D. degree in 1604 he asserted the necessity of baptism, and contended that there could be no true Church without diocesan Bishops, and in 1606 he preached a sermon at St. Mary's for which he was called to account by the Vice-Chancellor for expressing 'popish opinions.' He became so marked a man that 'it was heresy to speak to him, and misprision of heresy to give him a civil salutation in the street'—so he told Heylin. But he took no notice; he felt it to be his mission to attack Puritanism in its stronghold, and he rallied round him a party which had already been formed under Buckeridge, but now became under Laud a dangerous rival to the dominant party of the place. So when, in 1611, he was elected President of St. John's, a violent protest was made against the appointment, chiefly through Dr. George Abbot, the most puritanical



of all the Oxford Puritans. The king, however, supported Laud, and he held his ground. His advancement did not render him one whit the less outspoken, nor his adversaries one whit the less ready to oppose him. On Shrove Tuesday, 1614, he preached a sermon in which he maintained that a Presbyterian was as bad as a Papist, and on Easter Day, Dr. Robert Abbot, having taken all Lent to prepare himself, made a violent personal attack upon him in a sermon which, 'according to the ancient custom of the University' (Heylin), he repeated on the following Sunday, when Laud himself was present.

As this is not intended to be a full biography of Laud, but merely to notice such points in his life as illustrate his main characteristics, we pass over his preferments—chaplaincies, livings, and the Archdeaconry of Huntingdon—and also the unfortunate episode of the Devonshire marriage, the part he took in which he never ceased to regret, and come to the year 1616, when he was made Dean of Gloucester. King James, who was not at first inclined to look with favour on Laud, was perhaps induced by what he had learned of his character when the case of the Presidentship of St. John's was brought before him, to think that he was the sort of man to clean out an Augean stable. When he offered him the Deanery of Gloucester, he said, 'Scarce ever a church in England is so ill-governed and so much out of order.' James was not mistaken in his man. The new dean at once girded himself up to 'set in order what was amiss.' But he had to fight for it as hard as he had fought at Oxford. 'The city,' writes Heylin, 'was at that time much pestered by the Puritan faction, which was grown multitudinous and strong by reason of the small abode which the Dean and Prebendaries made amongst them, the dull connivance of their Bishop, and the remiss government of their metropolitan.'<sup>1</sup> The Cathedral was sadly out of repair, and the Holy Table, according to the Puritan custom, was placed in the centre of the church, instead of the east end of the chancel. So predominant had Puritanism become, that this was the usual place for it in parish churches, but it was unusual in cathedrals. Hence Laud had no difficulty in persuading his chapter not only to repair and beautify the church, but also to place the Holy Table 'altar-wise' at the east end, and 'to make a reverence' towards it as they entered the church. The change, however, deeply offended the aged bishop, Dr. Miles Smith, one of the translators of the Bible; he declared that he would never enter the

<sup>1</sup> *Cypr. Angl.* p. 65.

Cathedral again while the altar was at the east end, and, though he lived eight years longer, he is said to have kept his word. Commotions against Laud's 'innovations' were raised in the city, but Laud, as usual, quietly persisted and carried his point. And here it must be observed once for all, that it was for no mere point of external decency and order (much as he valued both) that Laud, at Gloucester and at countless other places, insisted upon placing the Holy Table at the east end, and railing off the Sanctuary in which it stood. This was, in fact, the field on which the battle was fought between the Puritan and the Anglican theory of Divine Service. According to the former, preaching held the first place; according to the latter, worship, and the highest act of worship was the Holy Eucharist. The pulpit typified the one, the altar the other. So it may be said without exaggeration that every instance of Laud's success in altering the position of the Holy Table was an instance of his turning a Puritan into an Anglican place of worship.

Laud was certainly now in favour with the king, whose chaplain he was. Immediately after the disturbance at Gloucester (which, *more suo*, he left to settle itself, having carried his points), he accompanied James on a visit to Scotland, on which occasion the king, with his usual *insouciance*, told the Scotch divines that 'he had brought some English theologians to enlighten their minds.' This implies that he had confidence in Laud's ability to meet the argumentative Scots on their own ground. The king had also shown his approval of Laud's work at Oxford by sending in 1616 instructions to the Vice-Chancellor respecting the theological studies of the place, which quite fell in with Laud's views and clashed with those of the Puritans. Preachers were to adhere to the distinctive teaching of the Church, and students in divinity were to be 'excited to bestow their time on the fathers and councils, schoolmen, histories and controversies, making them the grounds of their studies.'<sup>1</sup> Laud also began to win the confidence of the heir-apparent to the throne, and also that of the favourite, Buckingham. So that in every way he was the man marked out for preferment when the opportunity occurred. It is necessary to bear this in mind, because it throws light upon what soon happened. In 1621 he was appointed Bishop of St. David's by the desire of the king, who, in offering the post to him, said that he knew the Deanery of Gloucester was 'a shell without a kernel.' Prince Charles and the Marquis of Buckingham are

<sup>1</sup> See Hutton, p. 18.

and,  
kept  
were  
d and  
or all,  
order  
nd at  
Holy  
ry in  
ch the  
theory  
g held  
e high-  
t typi-  
without  
ltering  
urning

whose  
nce at  
having  
o Scot-  
uciance,  
English  
that he  
entative  
own his  
616 in-  
ological  
s views  
were to  
tudents  
on the  
oversies,  
ud also  
to the  
So that  
ferment  
ear this  
ppened.  
ne desire  
that he  
without a  
gham are

also said to have pressed his claims, as it is highly probable that they would. But Bishop Williams also claimed the whole credit of the appointment; and Laud has been accused of base ingratitude for afterwards turning against the man who procured his first elevation to the bench. The charge is sanctioned by the highly respectable name of Bishop Hacket, who recounts at full length a conversation between King James and Bishop Williams, in which the bishop urges upon the reluctant king the claims of Laud. That Hacket recorded accurately what Williams told him we have not the shadow of a doubt; but about Williams's veracity we may be permitted to have considerable doubt. He was notorious for drawing the long bow; and especially, according to Clarendon, for inventing and recounting imaginary conversations which never occurred. That he may have mentioned Laud to the king is very likely, but that he had to use all his powers to persuade the king, as he said he had, is most improbable. There was the best of reasons why Williams should desire Laud out of the way. The king had intimated his wish to have Laud Dean of Westminster, that he might be always at hand. Williams was now Dean of Westminster, but in this very year, 1621, he was appointed Bishop of Lincoln, and he desired still to hold the deanery *in commendam*. By procuring the appointment of Laud to St. David's he got rid of an obstacle, and succeeded in his design of holding both Lincoln and Westminster. There was, therefore, no question of gratitude in the matter. The deanery of Westminster, which Williams prevented Laud from receiving, was a more eligible piece of preferment than the distant see of St. David's, which Williams may have been partly instrumental in procuring for him.

Adhering to our plan of touching only upon the crucial points of Laud's career, we pass over his doings in his far-off diocese, and turn to his famous controversy with the Jesuit, Fisher. This was important in two ways; it brought him into closer relationship with Buckingham, and it gave him an opportunity of showing the strength of his position as against Rome—a position from which he never swerved one hair's breadth. The circumstances which led to this controversy in 1622 must be briefly told. The Countess of Buckingham, mother of the all-powerful favourite, was being drawn towards Rome by a Jesuit Father who went by the name of Fisher, but whose real name was Percy or Perse. In the extreme sensitiveness to danger from Rome which then prevailed, it would have been highly inconvenient if one so

nearly connected with the Court had joined the Roman Communion. The king, always ready to air his controversial abilities, first tried to argue with Fisher himself, but found the Jesuit more than a match for him. Then he arranged two conferences, which were to be held in the presence of the Countess, between Fisher and Dr. Francis White, at that time rector of St. Peter's, Cornhill. The king seems to have thought Dr. White hardly a strong enough man for the work, and called in Laud as a stronger, who held a third conference with Fisher. The Countess was not permanently impressed, but her son was; Buckingham henceforth took Laud for his spiritual father, and was ruled by him in ecclesiastical matters until his death. Laud's *Relation of the Conference*, which he published with considerable enlargements in 1639 at King Charles's command, on purpose to show that his attitude had not changed in the seventeen years which had elapsed, is, in our opinion, one of the best and most convincing works on the tenableness of the Anglican position in relation to Rome that is extant. The 'Romish Recusant' is wise in his generation when, fortified by the opinion of Mr. Benson, he dissuades his readers from reading it. In support of an opposite view, we will give *our* readers a specimen, asking them to remark how characteristic it is of Laud in every way—of his exalted estimate of the part the king should play, of his firm belief in the *via media*, and his contempt for the cry of 'persecution':

'Let me be bold to observe to your Majesty in particular, concerning your great charge in the Church of England. She is in hard condition. She professes the ancient Catholic faith, and yet the Romanist condemns her for novelty of doctrine. She practises Church government as it hath been in use in all ages and all places where the Church of Christ hath been established both in and since the days of the Apostles, and yet the separatist condemns her for anti-christianism in her discipline. The plain truth is she is between these two factions as between two mill-stones, and unless your Majesty look to it, to whose trust she is committed, she will be ground to powder, to an irreparable dishonour and loss to this kingdom. And it is very remarkable that while both these press hard upon the Church of England, both of them cry out against persecution like froward children, who scratch, and kick, and bite, and yet cry out all the while as if they were killed. Now, to the Romanist I shall say this. The errors of the Church of Rome are grown now (many of them) very old, and when errors are grown by age and continuance to strength, they which speak for the truth, though it be of an older, are usually challenged for the bringers in of new opinions. And there is no greater absurdity stirring this day in Christendom than that the reformation of an old, corrupted Church, whether we will or not, must be taken for the building a new. And were not

this  
que  
it w  
still  
of s  
rupt  
sam  
clea  
him  
thou  
learn  
opin  
them  
thin  
so m  
cunn  
of p  
their  
miser  
in an  
long

A  
sage  
Perh  
of fo  
could  
How  
almo  
his a  
did S  
tiona  
the s  
going  
that l  
stand  
did,'  
about  
'Laby  
an Ar  
of a C  
the tr  
the p  
tants  
windir  
view.  
In

this so we should never be troubled with that idle and impertinent question of theirs, "Where was your Church before Luther?" for it was just there where theirs is now; one and the same Church still, no doubt of that; one in substance, but not one in condition of state and purity; their part of the same Church remaining in corruption, and our part of the same Church under reformation. The same Naaman, and he a Syrian still; but leprous with them, and cleansed with us—the same man still. And for the separatist, and him that lays his grounds for separation, or change of discipline, though all he says, or can say, be in truth of divinity and among learned men little better than ridiculous, yet since these fond opinions have gained some ground among the people, to such among them as are wilfully set to follow their blind guides through thick and thin, till they fall into the ditch together, I shall say nothing. But so many of them as mean well, and are only misled by artifice and cunning, concerning them I shall say thus much only, they are bells of passing good metal, and tuneable enough of themselves and in their own disposition; and a world of pity it is that they are rung so miserably out of tune as they are by those who have acquired power in and over their consciences. And for this there is remedy, but how long there will be I know not' (Introduction).

Admirers of Bishop Andrewes will observe in this passage the resemblance to Andrewes's cramped and jerky style. Perhaps it was a conscious imitation, for Laud made no secret of following Andrewes as his master. In life and doctrine he could not have done better; but in style perhaps he might. However, he makes his meaning perfectly plain. He could almost as easily have turned Puritan as Roman. And this was his attitude from first to last; he never changed. Most truly did Sir Edward Dering (a hostile and therefore an unexceptionable witness) say of him, that 'he was always one and the same man, that beginning with him at Oxon. and so going on to Canterbury, he was unmoved and unchanged; that he never complied with the times, but kept his own stand until the times came up to him'—'as they afterwards did,' adds Heylin.<sup>1</sup> An able reply to Laud was published about the middle of the century, the full title of which is: '*Labyrinthus Cantuariensis, or Doctor Laud's Labyrinth. Being an Answer to the late Archbishop of Canterburies Relation of a Conference between Himself and Mr. Fisher. Wherein the true grounds of the Roman Catholic Religion are asserted, the principal Controversies betwixt Catholics and Protestants thoroughly examined, and the Bishops Meandrick windings throughout his whole worke layd open to publicke view. By T. C.*'

In the same year (1622) Laud dealt a severe blow to his

<sup>1</sup> *Cypr. Angl.*

enemies on the other side; for there is no doubt that the 'Royal Injunctions' to the Clergy of that year were issued on Laud's advice. These 'Injunctions' forbade any preacher under the degree of a bishop, or a dean at the least, to preach the deep points of predestination, election, reprobation, or the universality, efficacy, resistibility or irresistibility of God's grace; they enjoined catechizing instead of preaching on the Sunday afternoons; and they required bishops to be more careful in licensing preachers. These 'Injunctions' were of course as applicable to Anglicans as to Puritans; but it was the latter alone who were practically affected by them; it was *they* who loved to discuss the 'deeper points' which their adversaries would have been content to leave untouched; it was *they* who magnified preaching above all other ordinances, and despised catechizing as mere food for babes, it was *they* who profited by the indiscriminate licensing of preachers who would be sure to be of their way of thinking. They raised, therefore, a vehement outcry against the 'Injunctions,' and laid the blame of them on the right shoulders, viz. those of Laud, who was now becoming one of the most unpopular men in the kingdom. His unpopularity was not decreased by the fact that the Lord Keeper, Williams, who had never been his friend, and was now less so than ever, was in the ascendant during the closing years of James I.'s reign. Laud's 'Diary,' from 1622 to 1625, is full of mysterious hints about the hostility of the Lord Keeper: 'I was with my Lord Keeper, to whom I found some had done me very ill offices'; 'I did dream that the Lord Keeper was dead'; 'I found that all went not right with the Lord Keeper'; 'My Lord K. met with me in the withdrawing chamber, and quarrelled with me *gratis*'; 'I was much concerned at the envy and undeserved hatred borne to me by the Lord Keeper';—these are some of the entries. Laud attributes Williams's enmity to his jealousy of the Duke of Buckingham's favour, and this may have been the occasion; but the fact is, Laud and Williams represented two very different lines of policy: Laud was all for 'thorough,' Williams for compromise; Williams did not altogether identify himself with the Puritans, but still less did he identify himself with the Anglicans; and the practical result of the line he took would, but for Laud, have undoubtedly been to keep Puritanism predominant. Laud's other great enemy, Archbishop Abbot, made no secret of his desire to puritanize England. He knew that Laud was the great obstacle to this design; and one of the last acts that need be recorded in connexion with this part of Laud's career shows how ready

Abb  
1622  
king  
poor  
insta  
Keep

any s  
at an  
given  
about  
did f  
come  
good  
thoug  
being  
abroad  
year,

T  
phase  
bend  
poore  
is, tha  
more  
of an  
Theo  
soul r  
coura  
troub  
'with  
sermo  
it pla  
How  
future

Life  
M  
C

THE  
Much



Abbot was to pick a quarrel with him. In the spring of 1624 the Clergy in convocation voted four subsidies to the king of four shillings in the pound. For the sake of the poorer clergy Laud wished that the money should be paid by instalments, and spoke to Buckingham about it. The Lord Keeper (for a wonder) approved, but the Primate did not :

‘His G. was very angry.—Asked, what I had to do to make any suit for the Church. Told me never any Bp. attempted the like at any time, nor would any but myself have done it. That I had given the Church such a wound, in speaking to any L. of the laity about it, as I could never make whole again. That if my L. Duke did fully understand what I had done, he would never endure me to come near him again. I answered : I thought I had done a very good office for the Church ; and so did my betters think. If his G. thought otherwise, I was sorry I had offended him.—And I hoped, being done out of a good mind, for the support of many poor vicars abroad in the country, who must needs sink under three subsidies a year, my error (if it were one) was pardonable.—So we parted.’<sup>1</sup>

The incident is worth recording, for it illustrates another phase of Laud’s character ; while he was stiff and unbending to his equals, he was kind and considerate to his poorer brethren among the Clergy—always supposing, that is, that they were not puritanically inclined. This will appear more markedly at a later stage. We now pause at the close of an era in Laud’s life. On March 27 King James died at Theobalds. ‘He breathed forth,’ writes Laud, ‘his blessed soul most religiously, and with great constancy of faith and courage.’ Laud heard of it as he ascended the pulpit ‘much troubled’ at Whitehall ; and ‘Being interrupted,’ he says, ‘with the dolours of the Duke of Buckingham, I broke off my sermon in the middle.’ The event changed Laud’s position ; it placed him at once in the possession of unrivalled power. How he used that power will, it is hoped, be the subject of a future article.

---

#### ART. IV.—THE LIFE AND LETTERS OF DEAN CHURCH.

*Life and Letters of Dean Church.* Edited by his daughter, MARY C. CHURCH. With a Preface by the Dean of Christ Church. (London, 1894.)

THE perusal of this volume is not free from disappointment. Much which might have been hoped for is not contained in

<sup>1</sup> *Diary*, March 29, 1624.

it. Some readers may have looked for judgments on many theological or historical questions on which Dean Church did not express an opinion in his published writings. Some may have anticipated that in the freedom of private letters there would be an absence of the habitual under-statement and reserve which, while they supplied part of his peculiar influence, were also not seldom embarrassing. Some, again, may have expected fuller indications of the Dean's methods of study than are here afforded.

To call attention to this aspect of the present work is to bear testimony to Dean Church's greatness. The disappointment we have spoken of is the result of eagerness to know what he thought on any subject, and those who will feel it are those who have to some extent realized his wide knowledge, his singular cultivation, his great power of using in the formation of practical judgments what he had read and observed.

Yet, if the publication of the book has brought with it disappointment, and if the letters have not as compositions the brilliance of the work of some writers we have known, and do not contain the elaborate discussions which have been characteristic of others, it will be intensely interesting to a large number of thoughtful readers.

In trying to estimate the interest and value of this *Life and Letters* it is natural to notice first the personal history which it contains. And this personal history is throughout significant. The glimpses of the future Dean's early home life in Lisbon and Florence, Leghorn and Lucca, Lecce and Naples, recall influences on his mind and character which cannot have been small. The story of his school life at Redlands, and his doubts 'whether we really could be so cocksure about the absolute truth of the Evangelical formulæ,' or how, if the 'right of private judgment' is 'one of the great watch-words,' we can 'condemn the Socinians, who go wrongly by using it,' and the picture of the 'reserved, serious, studious boy, loving books and already beginning to collect them, and with an eye to editions, which he used to search for among the second-hand book shops in Bristol' (pp. 8-9) exhibit in the boy traits which it was easy to observe in the man. So, too, at Oxford, the wish 'to be properly acquainted with Butler,' the appreciation of 'Maurice and his master Coleridge,' the 'deep impression' made by Newman's preaching (p. 17), are all instructive, and it is of special interest to observe, in the light of many subsequent events, a passage in a letter written to Mr. (afterwards Sir) Frederic Rogers two

years  
dated

of Ox  
invite  
Ward  
"talk  
umbro  
scream  
fight  
place  
wonder  
wish h  
every  
friend  
where  
are di  
had to  
person  
teache

A  
news  
for it.  
the le  
descri

<sup>1</sup> W  
letter t  
tions in  
the *Lij*  
passag  
Fellow  
fire and  
the ten  
has the  
manusc  
Possibl  
supposi  
absenc  
was 'su  
'could  
sentenc  
January  
Oriel F  
but a c  
written.

<sup>2</sup> Th  
January  
<sup>3</sup> H  
was als  
and our

years after Mr. Church obtained his Fellowship at Oriel,<sup>1</sup> and dated on the Vigil of All Saints, 1840 :

'Pugin has been staying with Bloxam. . . . The only specimens of Oxford that Pugin saw must have edified him. Jack Morris had invited the rest of the "Mountain" (Newman's name for them), *i.e.* Ward, Bloxam, and Bowyer, to dine with him in the Tower and "talk strong": and to their delight Bloxam brought Pugin as his *umbra*. Ward is said to have repeatedly jumped up and almost screamed in ecstasy at what was said, and Bowyer and Pugin had a fight about Gothic and Italian architecture; but what else took place I know not. Morris is not pleased with Pugin, however: I wonder if he has humbugged Bloxam. Do you know Bowyer? I wish he would not come here so much; his line is to defend what everybody else gives up, and he took the side of O'Connell and his friends against Pugin. These theological *συμπόσια* up in the Tower, where they "talk strong," as Morris says, and laugh till their heads are dizzy, are ticklish things. I met Gooch up there yesterday, and had to defend myself for thinking Hooker not merely a respectable person, but a Catholic divine, and entitled to be looked up to as a teacher' (pp. 26-27).

A little later in life came the starting of the *Guardian* newspaper<sup>2</sup> and the many reviews which Mr. Church wrote for it.<sup>3</sup> During almost the whole of 1847 he was abroad, and the letters he wrote at this time (pp. 65-132) are full of vivid descriptions indicative alike of insight into character and

<sup>1</sup> We notice a slight difference in printing between Dean Church's letter to Dr. Liddon of 1885, describing 'the Oriel Fellowship examinations in the old times,' as given on pp. 18-21 of this book, and as it is in the *Life of Edward Bouverie Pusey*, vol. i. pp. 66-69. In the latter the passage 'It used to be said that when James Mozley was in for the Fellowship he kept on till the last, and when it got dark lay down by the fire and wrote by firelight, and produced an essay of about ten lines, but the ten lines were such as no other man in [Oxford] could have written' has the word 'Oxford' bracketed, implying that it is not in the Dean's manuscript. It is printed without the brackets in the book before us. Possibly the respective editors may have had reasons unknown to us for supposing that Dean Church accidentally omitted the word. In the absence of such reasons, we would suggest that the intended meaning was 'such as no other man in' (*i.e.* as a candidate for the Fellowship) 'could have written.' This suggestion is supported by the following sentence in an article entitled 'Dr. J. B. Mozley' in the *Guardian* of January 9, 1878, p. 53: 'The story goes that in the examination for the Oriel Fellowship he produced for an essay a fragment of a dozen lines, but a dozen lines which no other man in the examination could have written.'

<sup>2</sup> The first number of the *Guardian* appeared on Wednesday, January 21, 1846.

<sup>3</sup> He continued throughout his life to write for the *Guardian*. He was also a contributor to the *British Critic*, the *Christian Remembrancer*, and our own pages.

appreciation of scenery. It is interesting to notice how, while he was in Italy, Dante was his 'unfailing companion,' and that the 'little well-worn volume of the *Divina Commedia*, which had been laid on Dante's tomb at Ravenna, is filled with marginal notes and jottings, bearing witness to its constant use, and to the associations which had grown up during the journey round numberless passages of the poem, the last entry at the closing canto of the *Paradiso* bearing the date, "Florence, Christmas Day, 1847" (pp. 133-34).

Mr. Church had been ordained deacon 'at Christmas, 1839,' 'in company, among others, with A. P. Stanley, whose contemporary he was' (pp. 22-23). In 1843, two years before his famous veto in conjunction with Mr. Guille-mard of the decree for the censure of Tract XC. (p. 56), 'he had been warned by the Head of his College that in the event of his applying for testimonials for Priest's Orders, they might in the present condition of affairs be refused him' (p. 45), and he was not ordained priest until 'the Christmas Ordination' of 1852 before leaving Oxford for the country parish of Whatley in Somerset, to the living of which he had been presented by Mr. Horner of Mells (p. 135).

It is easy to understand that 'a good deal in the life' in 'a little village of two hundred people, wholly agricultural in its occupations,' 'was at first unfamiliar and irksome' (p. 137) to one with the antecedents of Mr. Church. His *Village Sermons* have already shown the love for his work and his people which grew up at Whatley, and there are many indications of this in the present book. It has sometimes been the case that a great scholar and earnest and high-minded man has not been a good parish priest. The recollection of this fact adds to the pleasure with which we have read of the 'simple and unambitious' 'parochial method' which 'suited well the circumstances' of Whatley, of the daily visits to the 'parish school,' of the care for the 'Sunday school,' the 'night school,' and the children generally, of the 'sympathy which honestly and naturally entered into the familiar and homely details of' the 'everyday life' of the parishioners, and of the 'loyal and affectionate confidence' which succeeded to the 'hesitating welcome which' 'awaited' Mr. Church 'as a stranger' (pp. 138-9).

'By the old, and by the sick and dying, his visits were eagerly looked for. It was no uncommon request that he would come and sit by the bedside of the sick, watching with them until the dreaded 'turn of the night' had passed; and in any case of sudden or urgent illness, or to a dying person, he would be summoned in

hast  
pres  
infl  
of th  
was  
grow  
liber  
on o  
cond  
the g  
'  
mad  
all w  
celeb  
abou  
in lo  
and  
in th  
caref  
of ar  
and  
mean  
since  
those  
chur

T  
writ  
revie  
(p. 1  
Gray  
to th  
A  
appe  
his d  
whic  
geth  
with  
Chri  
Dear  
it ea  
by (C  
intro  
1871  
has l  
the C  
appe  
F

haste . . . for they longed not to pass away without the help of his presence and his prayers. And among the men of the village his influence was not less remarkable. The roughest and most turbulent of them did not question his authority, or refuse a respect which was never forgotten even in the free and frank intercourse which had grown up in the night schools or the cricket-field. No one took liberties with him, and men were quick to recognize a power which on occasion could flash out in prompt and stern rebuke of faults of conduct in a way that was all the more impressive by its contrast with the gentleness of his usual manner. . . .

'One who was for many years a parishioner recalls the impression made by his manner in church. "The first thing that impressed us all was the extreme solemnity and devotion with which Mr. Church celebrated the Holy Communion. We had heard nothing then about the Eastward position, but I can see now his slight figure bent in lowly reverence before the altar, giving the whole service a new and higher and holier meaning by his bearing and entire absorption in the act of worship." His sermons, short and clear and practical, carefully written so as to avoid the use of long or difficult words, or of any lengthened thread of argument, had the same simple reality and directness of purpose about them. None could mistake his meaning; but simple as his words were, they had a force and sincerity which made their way to the hearts and consciences of all those who gathered weekly to listen to him in the little village church' (pp. 139-41).

The smallness of the parish allowed time for reading and writing, and 'for many years' Mr. Church wrote 'articles and reviews' 'weekly for the *Guardian* and the *Saturday Review*' (p. 141). Letters of great interest, including many to Dr. Asa Gray, 'the distinguished American botanist' (p. 142), belong to this period of the life.

As far as the place in the volume which mentions the appointment of Mr. Church to the Deanery of St. Paul's and his consequent resignation of Whatley, the narrative portion, which is wisely kept in subordination to the letters, is altogether the work of Miss Church, except for a preface written with the graceful skill which is characteristic of the Dean of Christ Church. A somewhat lengthy description of the Dean's work at St. Paul's, vivid and fascinating, and making it easy to realize some of his peculiar powers, is contributed by Canon Scott Holland (pp. 205-35), and serves as an introduction to the letters which belong to the period from 1871 to 1890. Those who wish to understand how St. Paul's has become what it is to London life, or the singular force of the Chapter of the Cathedral in the years following the Dean's appointment, will do well to read it.

From this description onwards the letters are again

mostly left to tell their own tale, but there are some recollections of interest from the pen of Dr. Barrett, 'the President of the Congregational Union in 1894' (pp. 302-5), and Miss Church tells with touching simplicity the story of her father's death and burial (pp. 348-50):

'At Dover he passed the last few weeks that remained of life, waiting, as it seemed to those near him, under the shadow of a great awe, but with a patience, and gentleness, and simplicity which knew no failure. His thoughts turned still to his favourite books, which he had carried with him, Homer and Lucretius, Dante and Wordsworth, and Matthew Arnold; and he still followed, with something of his old keenness of interest, the course of public events. . . .

'On the 10th<sup>1</sup> of December, early in the morning and quite quietly, the end came.

'The Dean's love of Whatley had led him years before to choose a spot in the quiet country churchyard there for his last resting-place. And thither he was carried from St. Paul's, after the early Communion in the north-west chapel of the Cathedral, where his coffin lay in the midst, and the later funeral service, with its long procession, and solemn music, and gathering of many friends and colleagues. And there, in the snow-covered churchyard beside the chancel of the village church, and amid the farewell gathering of old friends and parishioners, he was laid to rest. He had left a strict charge that no memorial should be raised to him. Only one thing he had asked—that a stone like that which he had chosen to mark his son's grave at Hyères—and which, though he was spared the sorrow of knowing it, was also, within three years' time, to mark the grave of his youngest daughter there—should mark his own grave at Whatley, and that it should bear upon it the same lines from the *Dies Ira*—

Rex tremendæ majestatis,  
Qui salvandos salvas gratis,  
Salva me, fons pietatis.

Quærens me sedisti lassus,  
Redemisti crucem passus,  
Tantus labor non sit cassus.'

Before we proceed to notice some features of the Dean's character which are strongly illustrated by the work under review, we must congratulate Miss Church on the skill with which she has selected the letters,<sup>2</sup> and written the thread of

<sup>1</sup> '10th' is evidently a slip of the pen for 9th, the day on which the Dean died.

<sup>2</sup> Some critics may perhaps be of opinion that the editor would have acted more wisely if she had omitted some of the 'series of letters written during a visit to Greece in 1847,' which she tells us she only included 'after some hesitation' (p. vi). We think her decision was a wise one, both for the reasons which she mentions as having led her to give the letters, and also because they exhibit traits in the Dean which may be new to some readers of the book.

histor  
book  
besto

D  
tempo  
mark  
woul  
which  
earn  
and p  
lation  
'an e  
182-8  
was lo  
Manc  
Light

'I  
worth  
nobles  
make

D  
full o  
heigh  
as 'v  
be in  
spect,  
with  
that,  
to unc  
had n  
ligion  
man,'  
divisio  
'thoro  
genuin  
those  
men  
inexha  
himse

'T  
which  
sympat  
more c  
defects



history which connects them. To say that we think the book a not unworthy tribute to her father's memory is to bestow on it no small praise.

Dean Church's judgment on several distinguished contemporaries will be observed with interest. Readers will mark the foresight which anticipated that Bishop Temple would 'make one of our best Bishops,' and the appreciation which saw in the same prelate, 'a man of strong, masculine earnestness, sympathising with the masses; and alive to, and perhaps even frightened by, the powerlessness of speculation to meet the difficulties of mankind in general,' and 'an energetic, high-souled,' and 'most religious Bishop' (pp. 182-84). It will be noticed that a 'firm' and 'generous,' 'rule' was looked for from Bishop Fraser, when he was appointed to Manchester (p. 185), and that the Dean wrote of Bishop Lightfoot in 1879:

'If he goes to Durham, Bishop Butler will have a successor worthy of him, in the combination of innocence, simplicity, and pure nobleness of thought and purpose, with intellectual forces which make his fellows wonder and admire' (p. 273).

Dean Stanley was regarded as 'a prophet and leader; full of eagerness and enthusiasm and brilliant talent, all heightened by success, but without a creed to preach' (p. 169), as 'very delightful and attractive,' as 'sincerely longing to be in sympathy with every one for whom he could feel respect,' as having 'the basis of a very grand character,' but with the 'enormous disqualifications to a religious teacher' that, in addition to other 'intellectual defects,' he was unable to understand 'metaphysics and dogmatic statements,' and had no capacity 'for the spiritual and unearthly side of religion' (p. 293). While Bishop Wilberforce was 'a statesman,' and had 'a statesman's ways in great religious divisions,' he was also 'a man of very large sympathies,' 'thoroughly sincere,' with 'a great nobility of nature,' 'as genuine in his intercourse with the humble and poor as with those who responded to his own brilliant cleverness,' 'of all men of his time' coming 'next to Gladstone as a man of inexhaustible powers of work' (pp. 239-40). Mr. Gladstone himself is many times referred to:

'There never was a man so genuinely admired for the qualities which deserve admiration—his earnestness, his deep popular sympathies, his unflinching courage—and there never was a man more deeply hated, both for his good points, and for undeniable defects and failings' (p. 179).

'No man we have ever had has matched Gladstone in the grasp and daring, combined with thorough detailed knowledge of his great legislative constructions. . . . Gladstone's weak point is what is most amiable in him, his strong vein of sentiment. It is the spring of what is noblest about his impulses; but it is a perilous quality too' (p. 188).

'Never for hundreds of years has so much honest, disinterested pains been taken to fill the Primacy' (p. 307).

'To my knowledge Mr. Gladstone goes from communion with God to the great affairs of State' (p. 305).

And we cannot refrain from quoting the singularly penetrating letter about Mr. W. R. Greg:

'I always read anything of his on moral or religious questions. It is like reading Lucretius or Horace, in the reality of the pathetic strain in which he writes. Other people, even \* \* \*, cannot shake off what Christianity has planted in their blood, even if they deny it with all the violence in the world. They are unconscious believers in better things to come, and can no more help it than they can help thinking in English. But Greg always seems to me *really* to look on life as they did who had never heard of revealed religion. There is a genuine feeling about life, as without any knowledge beyond the mere auguries of nature. And the profound melancholy of it is expressed in words, the beauty and tenderness of which have rarely been equalled' (p. 263).

The judgments from which we have quoted, and those on individuals throughout the book, are marked by balance and fairness which it is very rare indeed to find in opinions expressed about great men in their lifetime, or shortly after their deaths.

This is but one illustration of the evenness and justice of the Dean's mind. Others may be seen in a letter on the French and German war, in his view of the Church of England, and in his estimate of one part of the Ritualistic controversy. The first of these is so striking, that we may be allowed to quote the greater part of it:

'With your wrath against the strange and scandalous lying with which the French have tried to help out their shortcomings I go with all my heart. That a whole nation, or at least all speaking in its name, should have suddenly disclosed such a rooted habit of falsehood and imposture, is a terrible bit of the modern natural history of man. One used to think Carlyle's account of Barrère's *Vengeur* a little over-coloured. But Barrère has been beaten by Gambetta. . . .

'But I think there is a good deal to be said for French obstinacy, and hoping against hope. I think that now the Loire army is at an end, as I suppose it is, the end of hope is come. But up to this

point I  
and we  
most  
'I  
the far  
not on  
must n  
abunda  
ment a  
actual  
penalty  
fortress  
negotia  
would  
revenge  
delusio  
great s  
war we  
great m  
Ireland  
France  
'Y  
abomin  
which  
express  
Prussia  
march,  
for it  
long, u  
express  
and te  
of hun  
barbar  
applian  
horribl  
right i  
wicked  
me alr  
which  
have d  
of Pru  
196-98  
In  
face w  
ing, c  
anoma  
despa  
sight  
value

point I think the French chances, though poor, were not worthless, and were such as to make continued resistance to be naturally felt the most sacred of political duties by a Frenchman.

'I think peace ought to have been made after Sedan, and it was the fault of Paris and its leaders that it was not made. But it was not only, nor I think mainly, their fault that it was not made. We must not say that France would not confess itself beaten. It was abundantly willing to do so. It had received the most cruel punishment and humiliation that any great nation had received, without being actually ruined, like Prussia after Jena; this surely was part of the penalty of the war, and in spite of the "not one stone of our fortresses," other penalties and humiliations might have been got, if negotiations could have been *bond fide* set going. But the Prussians would not make peace easy; they determined to have the additional revenge of marching to Paris, and they were possessed with that fatal delusion about drawing the teeth of their enemy. And so, to their great surprise and against their calculations, Paris held out, and the war went on. And I think it would have gone on with us if, after a great naval disaster, the terms of peace had been the surrender of Ireland; and we should have been willing to suffer as much as France before we accepted those terms.

'You see my disgust at French lying and vapouring and vanity, abominable and astonishing as it is, is mixed with another feeling, of which I feel it difficult to express the strength. I have not words to express my admiration at the unequalled intellectual greatness of the Prussian success; its preparations, its magnificent uninterrupted march, its absolute unchequered triumph. It beats Napoleon hollow, for it depends so much less on imposture, and so much more on long, underground, patient headwork. But I also have not words to express my fear and detestation of the morality and political spirit and temper which has been the mainspring of this great achievement of human intellect. It seems to me the revival of the military barbarism of the kings and nobles of the old times, with all the appliances of modern knowledge to help them, and make them more horribly proud, arrogant, relentless in their will, contemptuous of right in their means, unmeasured in their claims. The French wickedness, their conceit and lies and chattering insolence, seem to me almost childish by the side of the deliberate pride of force of which the German nature is so capable, and which seems to me to have disclosed itself in such proportions since Bismarck and William of Prussia became its masters and have taught it its strength' (pp. 196-98).

In the Dean's view of the Church of England he is able to face with perfect honesty all that is 'inconsistent,' or perplexing, or disheartening, and to recognize the 'defects and anomalies' which have led some less balanced minds to despair. But this frank recognition does not make him lose sight of the 'vigour,' the 'power of recovery,' the 'increasing value for what is good and true' in the English Church, or of

the existence of 'defects and anomalies' in 'every Church' that he knew of or had 'ever heard of.' It does not hinder him from the enthusiastic statement that 'in spite of disasters and menacing troubles' the English Church is 'the most glorious Church in Christendom' (pp. 257-59).

It is an invidious task to make comparisons between one part of the Catholic Church and another; but we are confident of the soundness of the main attitude of the statements to which we have referred. If English Churchmen are to fulfil their true position and to do their duty alike to their own branch of the Church and to Christians at large, it will be as they honestly acknowledge what is painful in past history and faulty at the present time, while they insist on the real merits and capacities which none the less exist. We have too much of blindness to failings it is unpleasant to see and of assumptions that because there are faults there is little or nothing that is good.

In the ritual troubles it was the unfairness of the treatment of the Ritualists that Dean Church cared about most. Of the Ritualists themselves he was, at any rate for a time, not without fear. In 1866, after Keble's funeral, he wrote:

'Besides the people I used to think of with Keble there was a crowd of younger men, who no doubt have as much right in him as we have, in their way—Mackonochie, Lowder, and that sort. Excellent good fellows, but who, one could not help being conscious, looked upon us as rather *dark* people, who don't grow beards and do other proper things' (p. 172);

and in 1873 he wrote to Dr. Pusey:

'I feel that some of these younger men, whom I cannot go along with, are so very much my superiors, and beyond my criticism, in their devotion and earnestness. But I dread to think what the end may be from self-will and *ὑβρις*, where otherwise, in spite of everything, there seems more hope than I can see anywhere else' (p. 243).

But whatever fears of this kind he might have, on the question of justice he spoke with uncompromising strength.

'It is a bad time when people get to feel that they really cannot get justice and fair play. . . . It is this determination, in courts of justice, to find a meaning and a direction where there is none, and to close questions which at the least are open ones, which is enough to drive fair and quiet men into savage thoughts and feelings' (pp. 147-48).

'Let the Ritualists have common justice in such a Church as ours, and not the Mackonochie and Purchas judgments expressed by Lord Penzance, on the motion of outsiders and the Church Association, and then it will be time to call on moderate people to protest

again  
extra  
in oth  
cause  
amon  
I am.  
bisho  
and h  
Parlia  
Churc  
sacrifi  
256).

tried  
law co  
Archb  
by a r  
law, w  
the on  
the en  
the C  
screw  
and s  
enforc  
test of

'T  
It is c  
I can  
quittin

'V  
and m  
dignif  
sonali  
immor

T  
symp  
such  
Engli  
such  
neces

1 T  
time v  
Church  
with w  
2 T  
Canter  
deliver  
him 'h  
and co

against them. But I will never be a party to screwing up the Church extra tightly in one particular point, and leaving it as loose as it is in others which are as grave. I certainly do think that we have great cause to complain of the way in which law has been administered among us. . . . You cannot be more afraid of Disestablishment than I am. But I am sure of this, that the Archbishop's (that is, Archbishop Tait) 'trust in such Church law as now goes under the name, and his forcing on men's minds, by a policy of coercion, how much Parliament, as it is, may claim to do with the internal interests of the Church, will not help to avert it. That it may be averted by any sacrifice except of justice and honour, I pray day and night' <sup>1</sup> (p. 256).

'The Bishops, frightened by a movement which they have not tried to understand or govern, have encouraged appeals to law. The law courts have roughly attempted to maintain existing usage. The Archbishop has aggravated the mischief by stirring up the country by a measure intended to facilitate the operation of this judge-made law, while he steadily discountenances any attempt to control it by the only constitutional organ of legislation left to the Church. And the end is, that while all sorts of liberties are allowed to parties in the Church which the public opinion of the hour sanctions, a tight screw is put on the one unpopular one, and a grotesquely one-sided and stiff conformity to minute legal interpretations of rubrics is enforced by penalties, and is preached and paraded as the crucial test of loyalty to the Church and honest obedience to the law.

'To me this seems to be unjust, unconstitutional, and oppressive. It is certainly exasperating and impolitic. But the only way in which I can show that I am in earnest in so thinking and speaking is by quitting the high position which I hold' (p. 259).

'While Mr. Bell Cox goes to prison for having lighted candles and mixed water with the wine, and refusing to give up such things, dignified clergy of the Church can make open questions of the personality of God, and the fact of the Resurrection, and the promise of immortality' <sup>2</sup> (p. 324).

The *Church Quarterly Review* will not be suspected of sympathy with 'self-will and ὑβρις,' and it may be feared that such frames of mind are not becoming less common among English clergy; but we are bound to observe how much of such temper that has been and is dangerous is due to a past necessity of resisting unjust treatment which was applied in

<sup>1</sup> This letter was written in 1877. In 1870 he had anticipated that a time would come when Disestablishment would be a necessity if the Church was not to abandon distinctive truth so as to be made 'co-extensive with what can be called the religion of the whole nation' (p. 187).

<sup>2</sup> This letter was written in 1887 to the present Archbishop of Canterbury. The judgment in the trial of the Bishop of Lincoln was delivered in November 1890, shortly before the Dean's death. It caused him 'happiness,' and 'seemed to come to him with a touch of reassurance and confirmation in' his 'steady trust in the English Church' (p. 349).

the name of law. It is impossible to use legal processes as a means of injustice and to avoid Nemesis.

With the sense of justice which has been almost universally recognized in Dean Church, and which is, as we have noticed, strikingly illustrated by these letters, is connected the reserve which was scarcely less marked in his character. And of this reserve also the letters supply instances. Among these we may notice passages which deal with the human knowledge of our Lord and with the subject of pain. In a letter written in 1878 there is the following guarded statement on the former of these questions :

‘I shrink much from speculating on the human knowledge of our Blessed Lord, or the limitations—and they may have been great—which He was pleased to impose on Himself when He “emptied Himself,” and became as one of us. I have never been satisfied with the ordinary explanations of the text you quote, St. Matt. xxiv. 36. They seem simply to explain it away as much as any Unitarian gloss on St. John i. 1. To me it means that He who was to judge the world, who knew what was in man, and more, who alone knew the Father, was at that time content to have that hour hidden from Him—did not choose to be above the angels in knowing it—as He was afterwards content to be forsaken of the Father. But the whole is perfectly inconceivable to my mind, and I could not base any general theory of His knowledge on it. I think it is very likely that we do not understand the meaning of much that is said in Scripture—its sense, and the end and purport for which *at the time* it was said. But it would perplex me much to think that He was imperfect or ignorant in what He *did* say, whether we understood Him or not’ (pp. 267–68).

We do not profess to agree with the treatment of St. Matthew xxiv. 36<sup>1</sup> in this letter. But the subject of the human knowledge of our Lord has been discussed so often in our pages in the last few years that it is unnecessary we should here reopen it, or the theological questions with which it is connected, except for a word of protest against the absence of explanation of the statement that He ‘who alone knew the Father’ was ‘forsaken of the Father.’ Our present purpose is to call attention to what we have described as the reserve of the letter. It is said that our Lord was ‘content to have’ the ‘hour hidden from Him’; but such a position is at the same time declared to be ‘perfectly inconceivable,’ and is carefully guarded from being used to supply an argument for

<sup>1</sup> From the reference being to St. Matthew xxiv. 36, rather than to St. Mark xiii. 32, we assume that the Dean was of opinion that the words *οὐδὲ ὁ υἱός* were rightly inserted by the revisers in the former passage.

a ‘ge  
add  
from  
regar  
perpl  
A  
on pa

‘A  
Lord  
not, b  
its app  
I cann  
that D  
and u  
sufferin  
I can,  
theory  
and ho  
longer  
to me  
in prop  
all that  
Him w  
experie  
pass so  
is, what  
of it?  
otherwi  
the Fat  
limitati  
His min  
‘But

but our  
attempt  
being c  
circums  
question  
to get th  
that is,  
obvious  
answers  
things to  
asking w  
was not  
action, t  
going on  
present  
with the  
VOL.



a 'general theory of' the 'knowledge' of Christ. A caution is added that the meaning of Holy Scripture may often be hidden from us, and it is finally said, not that it is impossible to regard our Lord as 'imperfect or ignorant,' but that 'it would perplex' the writer 'much to think that He was' either.

A somewhat similar reserve is to be found in the passage on pain in a letter written in 1879 :

'As far as I understand the difficulty it is this : How could our Lord *really* have sympathized in *all* human pain, when He could not, by supposition, have known that which gives it its worst sting—its apparent uselessness and its helplessness ? Well, I can only say that I cannot form the faintest conception how, in the actual depths of that Divine suffering nature, all human pain was borne, and shared, and understood. I can only see it from the outside. I see the suffering ; I am told, on His authority, what it means and involves. I can, if I like, and as has often been done, go on and make a theory *how* He bore our sins, and *how* He gained their forgiveness, and *how* He took away the sins of the world. But I own that the longer I live the more my mind recoils from such efforts. It seems to me so idle, so, in the very nature of our condition, hopeless, just in proportion as one seems to grasp more really the true nature of all that went on beyond the visible sight of the Cross, all that was in Him who was God and Man, whose capacities and inner life human experience cannot reach or reflect. But one of the thoughts which pass sometimes through our minds about the sufferings of the Cross is, what *could* be the necessity of such suffering ? What *was* the use of it ? How, with infinite power, could not its ends have been otherwise attained ? Why need He have suffered ? Why could not the Father save Him from that hour ? Did that thought, in the limitations and "emptying" (Phil. ii. 7) of the Passion pass through His mind too ?

'But I suppose that, after all, the real difficulty is not about Him, but ourselves. Why pain at all ? I can only say that the very attempt to give an answer, that the very thought of an answer *by us* being conceivable, seems to me one which a reasonable being in our circumstances ought not to entertain. It seems to me one of those questions which can only be expressed by such a figure as a fly trying to get through a glass window, or a human being jumping into space ; that is, it is almost impossible to express the futility of it. It is obvious that it is part of a wider subject, that it could not be answered *by itself*, that we should need to know a great many other things to have the power of answering. And what is the use of asking what we cannot know ? Why we are what we are ; how what was not came into being ; what is the present life, the mode of action, the Presence of the Divine Being ; what is eternity ; what is going on in the fixed stars ? It is one of those questions about our present condition of which, if we choose, we may ask any number, with the same chance of an answer. Why is Nature, being so

perfect, yet so imperfect? Why, of all the countless faces which I meet as I walk down the Strand, are the enormous majority failures—deflections from the type of beauty *possible* to them? Why are there poisons, and what is the use of poisonous beasts? For a snake, a bee, a wasp, don't want their poisons to take their food. Or to take what to me is as much the crux of our condition as pain—the relation of the sexes, the passion of love; how strange, how extravagant, how irrationally powerful over all the world, how at the root of the best things of life, how at the root of its very worst! Strange, ambiguous, perplexing lot for creatures made in the image of God. . . . 'Our Lord came among us not to clear up the perplexity, but to show us which side to take' (pp. 274-76).

We can express our sense of the high value of this letter without committing ourselves to approval of every sentence in it. Behind all explanations of moral and intellectual problems further difficulties remain. If, for instance, the true doctrine of the Person of Christ shows that, in spite of His impeccability, and even in a higher degree because of it, He experienced suffering in temptation, and can sympathize with the tempted, the difficulty remains that the temptation to do what is wrong for the sake of a good end comes to a high-minded man because he has imperfectly realized that the course of duty is always, in the proper sense, expedient, while in the case of our Lord there could be no such imperfect realization. Or again, the valuable answers which apologists have given to the well-known problems about free-will, or the sufferings of the innocent, or the laws of life, or the source of evil, simply lead up to inscrutable puzzles, such as whether any general law of nature could be different and the Nature of God remain the same, or why the Being of God is as It is. There are few things that do more harm than superficial statements that all is made clear, while in reality that which is most fundamental in the difficulty is left untouched. And what Christian writers in some departments need more than anything else is the courage to face the fact that all has not been made clear, and to say: 'Our Lord came among us not to clear up the perplexity, but to show us which side to take.'

We think, as we have implied, that his reserve was, to at any rate a large extent, the result of the justice of Dean Church's mind. It is a rare thing for a human being to escape some weakness on his strong side. And, in our opinion, Dean Church did not altogether escape it. If we are not mistaken, it was this very sense of justice which led to a fear of dogmatism where he might rightly have been dogmatic. We may notice two instances of this in the present volume. The first instance is in his comments on

Dr. M.  
Writing

'Mo  
the brea  
it need  
dogmati  
thinking  
the Chu  
compati  
are wron  
than of

We  
thinkin  
much h  
doctrine  
his eye  
Church  
assertio

The  
already  
The gen  
after th  
Univers  
This le  
nearly a  
before i  
'ignorant  
mercy,  
appears  
meaning

'Script  
very gene  
yesterday  
in its Scr  
exasperat  
exact del  
were used  
ject. I c  
of the S  
intended-  
attained v  
and what

If we  
refer to

Dr. Mozley's *Primitive Doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration*. Writing in 1855 he says :

'Mozley's book will no doubt make a great row, and accomplish the break up that J. H. N. began. I am very sorry for the result ; yet it need not have come if our friends had not stuck up for so much dogmatic certainty, and drawn so narrowly the limits of liberty of thinking. In the Middle Ages, and much more in the early times of the Church, there was infinitely more free speculation than seems compatible with Church views now. I think it must be we who are wrong. The nature of things seems more in favour of the old way than of ours' (p. 145).

We are not going to assert that 'the' limits of liberty of thinking' have never been too greatly restricted, or that too much has never been made of 'dogmatic certainty.' But the doctrine of Baptism is hardly one on which a teacher with his eye on the 'Middle Ages' and the 'early times of the Church' has any right to hesitate and abstain from dogmatic assertion.

The second instance is in a letter from which we have already quoted a passage on our Lord's human knowledge. The general subject of this letter, which was written in 1878, after the Dean's sermon on 'Sin and Judgment'<sup>1</sup> in the University pulpit at Oxford, is that of eternal punishment. This letter, as well as two others, which, though written nearly a year previously, the Editor has placed immediately before it, contains very much of the highest value on the 'ignorance' of man and the 'certainties of God's justice, mercy, and love.' But there is in it a paragraph which appears to us to shrink unduly from insisting on the obvious meaning of some Scriptural language :

'Scripture, though awfully plain-spoken and stern, seems to me very *general* in its language on this matter. I heard a sermon yesterday in the same sense as \* \* \* 's, and, though it was forcible in its Scripture proofs, I can only say it simply worried and almost exasperated me, because it assumed all through that we knew the exact definite purport of the Scripture terms used, and that they were used in exact correspondence with our own on the same subject. I doubt the assumption, and if I am asked "What is the use of the Scripture language?" my answer is that the general aim intended—viz. the certain and terrible punishment of sin—may be attained without satisfying definite questions about *how*, and *how long*, and *what next*' (p. 267).

If we are right in understanding the words 'how long' to refer to the question of the eternity of punishment, this

<sup>1</sup> Sermon IV. in *Human Life and its Conditions*.

passage appears to mean either that the Dean hesitated to affirm that the condemnation of the lost is everlasting, or that he based his belief in its everlasting character on philosophical considerations rather than on the language of the New Testament.

We do not know whether Dean Church wrote other letters which referred to the controversy which arose about the criticism of the Old Testament in connexion with the publication of *Lux Mundi* besides that which he sent to Dr. Liddon in reply to the latter's expression of sympathy with him at the time of Lord Blachford's death. But if we may assume that the Editor would not have withheld any letter of importance and general interest on this subject, we cannot but think that in this case also there was a hesitancy parallel to that in the two instances which we have given.<sup>1</sup> In this letter Dean Church, after thanking Dr. Liddon for his 'kind thoughts,' goes on to say :

'It gives edge to such trials when troubles and anxieties such as you speak of are added to them. Ever since I could think at all I have felt that these anxious and disturbing questions would one day or other be put to us, and that we were not quite prepared or preparing to meet them effectively. To us Church people the general answer was so clear that it made us think that they wanted no further trouble ; and they have been left outside our sphere of interest, to be dealt with by a cruel and insolent curiosity, utterly reckless of results, and even enjoying the pleasure of affronting religion and religious faith. This was sure to be, from the intellectual and moral conditions of our time ; but it seems to me that our apologetic and counter-criticism has let itself be too much governed by the lines of the attack, and that we have not adequately attempted to face things for ourselves and in our own way, in order not merely to refute, but to construct something positive on our own side. That, it seems to me, is the great triumph of Bull's *Defensio* and of your Bampton's, and we want something of the same kind, which has not yet been done, for the Bible—what it really is, how it came to be, who gave it us. That the difficulties about it have been forced, not on arrogant and conceited "experts," claiming monopoly of all criticism, but on deep-thinking and devout Catholic believers like \* \* \*, and have given him trouble, seems to me to show that there is something unsatisfactory in the present condition of things—though I am the last person to know what ought to be done to meet it. All that I can say for myself is that for such men my trust is in patience and sympathy' (pp. 341-2).

<sup>1</sup> Such an attitude might be to some extent due to the Dean's humility as well as to his justice. His humility was characteristically illustrated by his unwillingness to accept the Deanery of St. Paul's (pp. 199-203, 207-8). His subsequent refusal to become Archbishop of Canterbury (p. 307) was probably justified by 'reasons of health.'

Yet, though the letter appears to be to a certain extent in deprecation of the vigorous and uncompromising attitude which Dr. Liddon consistently assumed on this matter, it will be observed that its general tone is that of opposition to what we are frequently told are the certain and necessary results of the critical study of the Old Testament. And we may compare, in this respect, the somewhat stronger language of a letter written to Lady Welby a few months earlier in 1889 :

'But—apart from scholars and people claiming independence—when the ordinary mass of us have to choose between speaking of the Bible as the Church has hitherto done and the new language of criticism, it is fair to ask, "What *does* criticism say?" And here it seems to me that, while the questions have been innumerable, and the answers also, the crop of clear, certain, convincing answers has been a strangely small one. Nothing seems to me more remarkable than the contrast in our time between the certainties of physical science and the contradictory and uncertain results, the barrenness, as a whole, of criticism applied to the questions which most interest men.

'I certainly know no one who is capable of revising the received belief about the Old and New Testament' (p. 337).

These passages may well, in our judgment, be carefully considered by a numerous class of persons who, without adequate knowledge either of theology or of criticism, are boastfully adopting opinions about Holy Scripture which run counter to the traditional belief of the Church and are full of lofty contempt for all who do not agree with them. And the Dean's words have a lesson, too, for eminent scholars whose attitude towards the criticism of the Bible has been anything but cautious.

Nor is a reminder less needed in some quarters that the traditional way of regarding Holy Scripture will hardly hold its ground without patient and detailed and constructive study of the sacred text.

In writing of this book we have referred mostly to very serious subjects. It has a lighter side in the accounts of travel already alluded to and in many literary allusions, of which one of the most interesting is in the 'account of the Dean's experience as a student of Browning's poetry,'<sup>1</sup> while there are abundant signs of such a 'sense of humour' as that of which the Dean of Christ Church wisely says in the preface that it 'seldom gets due credit for the good work it does or helps to do' (Preface, p. xviii).

We have, we hope, shown that thoughtful readers cannot afford to overlook the *Life and Letters of Dean Church*. And,

<sup>1</sup> In a letter to Mr. Stanley Withers, dated 'February 9, 1890,' printed on pages 342-44. We regret there is not much more of what we may call 'literary correspondence.'

even apart from its merits, it will be valued as a memento of the high and noble life of a teacher of the widest knowledge and the most fearless honesty, who has left a deep mark in many thinkers of his day.

Yet, deeply as he marked cultivated Christian thought in England, our knowledge of Dean Church's published writings is tinged with regret. There are reviews and essays, lectures and sermons, short historical books—all filled with deep thought, singular suggestiveness, and skilled writing; but there is no *magnum opus*. The student who could have luminously lighted up by-ways of history has not done so on any large scale; the writer who could have told with vivid power the rise or the fall of great empires has not left any book which can be put on the same shelf with Gibbon's masterpiece; the critic, philosopher, historian, and divine who could have given us a history of the Papacy which, by its insight into cause and effect, its grasp of great principles of human thought, its knowledge of facts, its entire impartiality and unsurpassed judgment, would not only have been a work of the highest interest, but would have supplied the rational basis for a just estimate of the Church of Rome and a right attitude towards the reunion of Christendom, has left this task undone. It is not only intellectually tantalizing, it is, we feel, a moral loss to the English-speaking races that the powers which the Dean's books most abundantly exhibit should not have found a wider scope and, it may be, a more permanent usefulness.

#### ART. V.—THE TEXT OF THE SYRIAC GOSPELS.

1. *The Four Gospels in Syriac, transcribed from the Sinaitic Palimpsest.* By the late ROBERT L. BENSLEY, M.A., and by J. RENDEL HARRIS, M.A., and by F. CRAWFORD BURKITT, M.A.; with an Introduction by AGNES SMITH LEWIS. (Cambridge, 1894.)
2. *A Translation of the Four Gospels from the Syriac of the Sinaitic Palimpsest.* By AGNES SMITH LEWIS, M.R.A.S. (London, 1894.)

A GENERATION has passed away since the publication by Cureton of a Syriac text,<sup>1</sup> which has necessarily been noticed, for commendation or disparagement, by every subsequent

<sup>1</sup> *Remains of a very Antient Recension of the Four Gospels in Syriac, hitherto unknown in Europe.* By William Cureton, D.D., 1858. Dedicated to the Prince Consort.

wrote  
disse  
light  
place  
tradi  
shoul  
diffic  
The  
last a  
Cure  
more  
Lewi  
the o  
in the  
Orie  
volun  
gener  
lished  
schol  
story  
hear  
third  
shoul  
trans  
enou  
V  
since  
sever  
serio  
critic  
Noti  
in M  
in th  
ambi  
disco  
equal  
Guan  
title  
Gosp  
conn  
MS.  
than  
ducti  
Syria



writer on the original text of the Gospels. The fortunate discoverer of the venerable remains then first brought to light predicted in his *Dedication* that they would take their place in the ranks of Christian literature. Different and contradictory opinions have prevailed as to what that place should be. While Cureton's text was unsupported it was difficult to criticize it, except on grounds of internal evidence. The aspect of the case has now changed. The publication last autumn of another recension, very closely related to Dr. Cureton's, has enlarged the field of observation, while the still more recent publication of the English translation of Mrs. Lewis's codex has brought the subject within the sphere of the ordinary reader. The spread of education has produced in these days a multitude of divinity students who are neither Orientalists nor scholars, but who will welcome a handy little volume. We note as a sign of our times, and what in a former generation would not have been essayed, much less accomplished, that it is a lady who has discovered the codex for scholars and popularized its contents for the masses. The story of two expeditions has been told by her sister,<sup>1</sup> and we hear that, even as we write, these intrepid ladies are making a third search in the Library of St. Catherine's Convent. We should not be surprised to see them return with other precious transcripts, but the publication of a 'Codex Ludovicus' is enough to shed lustre on a lifetime.

We hasten to place in the forefront of our remarks this sincere expression of our admiration of the courage and perseverance of the ladies as discoverers, because we must find serious fault with the work of one of them when she essays criticism and commentary. We have already, in our *Short Notice* in the January number, referred to the signs of haste in Mrs. Lewis's work, which are indicated by the inaccuracies in the Introduction to her *Translation*. Her first line is ambiguous, for she describes her manuscript as 'the lately-discovered Codex of Old Syriac Gospels.' Mr. Burkitt is an equal offender when, in a signed communication to the *Guardian*<sup>2</sup> (to which we shall refer again), he takes as his title *The Sinai Palimpsest of the Old Syriac Version of the Gospels*. These descriptions may, and ought to, be read in connexion with Mr. Burkitt's statement that the Sinaitic MS. contains what he calls 'Syr. vt.' in a purer form than the Curetonian, and with Mrs. Lewis's references (*Introduction*, p. xiii) to the 'Curetonian Gospels' and to 'the Old Syriac text;' but the unwary may be led to suppose that

<sup>1</sup> *How the Codex was Found*. By Margaret Dunlop Gibson, 1893.

<sup>2</sup> October 31, 1894, pp. 1707-8.

Mrs. Lewis's Palimpsest and Cureton's Codex are copies of one text. They represent the same text, but yet they are rather recensions of it than copies, if the latter term be used in the sense in which we speak of a copy of Homer, or of St. John, meaning a transcript, more or less faithful, of the text of the writer. Mrs. Lewis's Introduction prefixed to the Syriac text is more carefully composed than her Introduction to her *Translation*. Her English book, while it will be useful to many, will also mislead some readers. We merely advert in passing to the strange statements in the philological arguments on pp. xv and xvii, which seem to imply that the vernacular of Mesopotamia was almost identical with that of Palestine in the time of our Lord,<sup>1</sup> and which apparently confuse the latter dialect with what is called technically 'Palestinian Syriac.'<sup>2</sup> We remind the reader that the Palestinian Syriac version is not 'extant only in the form of a lectionary,' for fragments have been published of what seems to have been a complete copy of the Pauline Epistles.<sup>3</sup> Passing to a more serious fault, we find that on p. xxvii Mrs. Lewis writes about the last twelve verses of St. Mark as follows: '[The omission] occurs in other ancient codices, notably in both the Sinaiticus [*i.e.*  $\aleph$ ] and the Vaticanus . . . in the Greek Codices where these twelve verses do occur, the  $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omicron\varsigma$  ("end") is always found after verse 8 and also after verse 20.' Would the reader suppose from this statement that the codices in which these verses are found number *many hundreds*, and that they are omitted by *two* only?<sup>4</sup> We invite the attention of our readers, and of Mrs. Lewis, to a certain monograph on the subject, and to the other works named below.<sup>5</sup> But it is easier to ignore arguments than to refute them.

On p. xviii we read: 'The Peshittā, or "simple" version, . . . is one which underwent successive revisions in order to bring it into harmony with the Greek Codices.' This is in flat contradiction to the opinion of Mr. Gwilliam. Between him and Mrs. Lewis we will not attempt to interpose, except

<sup>1</sup> See Dr. Neubauer's *Dialects of Palestine*, pp. 53, 54, in *Studia Biblica*, vol. i. 1885.

<sup>2</sup> For this dialect see Schwally's *Idioticon d. Christ. palästinischen Aramäisch*.

<sup>3</sup> *The Palestinian Version* (Anecdota Oxoniensia), 1893, p. xix. Why does Mrs. Lewis seem to doubt what is the exact date of the Vatican Lectionary? 'About A.D. 1029' (p. xix). It was written in the year of the Greeks 1341; see *Versiones Syriacae* (Adler), p. 139.

<sup>4</sup> See *Nov. Test. Gr.* (Delectus Lectt. cur. Gul. Sanday), Oxon., 1889.

<sup>5</sup> Burgon's *Last Twelve Verses*. See also his *Revision Revised*, pp. 422-4; Scrivener's *Introduction*, 4th ed., vol. ii. pp. 340, 341; Miller's *Textual Guide*, p. 126; Dr. Taylor, Master of St. John's College, Cambridge, in *Expositor*, July 1893.

to re-  
mist-  
accum-  
facts,

I  
work-  
in th-  
ident-  
mark-  
there-  
readi-  
trans-  
he ai-  
the t-  
phras-  
her t-  
to th-  
perha-  
times-  
Mrs.  
who  
Ethel-  
for th-  
conne-

S  
of the  
disco-  
trans-  
if mo-  
perfe-  
woul-  
Mrs.  
as an  
given  
The c-  
maint-

1 T  
was co-  
and ha-  
the tex-

2 A  
3 2  
from t-

4 V  
point  
particip-  
the im-

to remark that the latter by her hasty statements and actual mistakes has not raised a presumption in favour of her critical acumen, while the former has thoroughly investigated the facts, and has given the grounds for his conclusion.<sup>1</sup>

In the English translation of Mrs. Lewis's text we have a work very different in character from that of Cureton. Even in the many places where the underlying Syriac is practically identical in each manuscript the English renderings are in marked contrast both in style and in language; the reader therefore must not assume the existence of different Syriac readings on account of a divergence in the translations. The translators had different objects in view. Cureton said that he aimed at presenting as literal a rendering as the idioms of the two languages would allow.<sup>2</sup> Mrs. Lewis has adopted the phraseology of the Authorized Version, and seeks to place her text before the English reader in such form as it assumed to those for whom the Syriac was intended. Her plan is perhaps more difficult of execution than Cureton's, and sometimes demands the sacrifice of verbal accuracy. On the whole, Mrs. Lewis has attained considerable success, and the reader who has before him these two translations, together with Etheridge's rendering of the Peshitto,<sup>3</sup> will be well equipped for the investigation of some of the most important problems connected with the history of the Syriac Gospels.

So much we can honestly declare, alike for the satisfaction of the many who will only know the *Lewis Gospels* through the discoverer's version of them, and in commendation of the translator herself. Our praise would be more heartily bestowed if more care had been taken to reach a higher standard of perfection. In not a few passages a more literal rendering would have been compatible with the idiomatic style which Mrs. Lewis has adopted. The participle is too often rendered as an aorist, by which the narrative loses the graphic touches given by the imperfect tense and by the historical present.<sup>4</sup> The distinction between  $\circ$  and  $\omega$  but is not consistently maintained. At Mark vi. 47 there is no need to leave out

<sup>1</sup> The collation of ancient Peshitto manuscripts on an adequate scale was commenced by the late Philip Edward Pusey, the son of Dr. Pusey, and has been continued by the Rev. G. H. Gwilliam, who has written on the text of the Peshitto in each volume of the Oxford *Studia Biblica*.

<sup>2</sup> *Antient Recension*, Preface, p. xciv.

<sup>3</sup> *The Syrian Churches, with a literal Translation of the Four Gospels from the Peshitto*, J. W. Etheridge, 1846.

<sup>4</sup> We allow that, in the present state of the palimpsest, the diacritical point being constantly illegible, it is often difficult to distinguish the participle when not followed by the substantive verb, but even when it is the *imperfect* force is often neglected.

the *and*, and say in the margin that the codex reads it.<sup>1</sup> Many other glosses are either unnecessary or inconsistent. If it was desirable to translate in the margin '*Ain Nun* (*Ænon*, John iii. 23) it is hard to see why other place names are left untranslated. The treatment of proper names is inconsistent. We have *Peter* and *Cepha*, *Thomas* and *Thoma*, *Isariot* and *Scariota*, although the last pair are in part made one by the corrigendum, at Mark iii. 19 only, 'read *Scariota passim*.' If there is reason for writing *Catana* (John xxi. 2) why not *Gallila*? and why not extend the transliteration to *Jerusalem*, *Jericho*, &c. The information is given (Matt. viii. 9) that *under me* is in Syriac *under my hand*, but many other much more curious idioms are unnoticed.<sup>2</sup> The gloss at John xx. 23 is wrong. Not '*he* is retained,' but '*it* is retained'—*each sin*, or, perhaps, collectively, *the guilt*.<sup>3</sup>

We do not multiply examples, because we should much regret to detract unduly from the praise we have already bestowed, and rightly too, for the *Translation* will, on the whole, be found of great service to the English reader, provided he is content to derive from it a general impression of the contents of the codex, and does not employ it as an instrument for verbal criticism. For the latter use some provision is made in the two Appendixes, I. of Greek words omitted, II. of Interpolations.

We have felt it our duty to animadvert on the errors in the *Introduction*, lest the reader should be misled by the dogmatism which the writer at times assumes. We are glad to pass on, and to express most cordially our admiration of the beauty of the edition of Mrs. Lewis's Syriac Gospels. The printing is worthy of the best work of the Cambridge University Press. The arrangement in leaves and columns is a great improvement on the style adopted by Cureton, and is in harmony with the laudable desire for accurate reproduction of the works of antiquity which characterizes the scholars of the present day. The pages, in their very appearance, suggest accuracy and critical care in every line. Each page is attested by one or more of the transcribers, the initials of Mr. Burkitt

<sup>1</sup> Translate, 'But when . . . and he was . . . and when he saw . . . (then) he cometh . . .'

<sup>2</sup> E.g. Matt. iv. 1, there is no gloss to *devil*; but if *beaten* (Luke xii. 47) has an illustration from modern Egyptian, why not explain the idiom by which the Devil is called 'Eater of Pieces'?

<sup>3</sup> Mark x. 51: 'Lord' occurs in the text, 'Rabbuli' in the margin. John xx. 16: Rabbuli is retained in the text, and rendered in the margin 'my master.' The Syriac scholar will note the former place with interest. It shows that ܕܡܠܟܐ in the latter place (which in the Peshitto is ܕܡܠܟܐ) is not a mistake for ܕܡܠܟܐ. See Schaaf's *Lexicon*, p. 529.

occurring, perhaps, most frequently. The difficulties of decipherment have not been overcome in every passage; some places remain doubtful, others might be read differently by other eyes. But on the whole we are induced to rely with much confidence on the accuracy of the text of this edition of a most interesting relic of Syriac literature.

The estimate which Cureton formed of the value of his discovery was naturally high. His opinion has in part been shared by a large number of scholars; in one direction, however, he has had, perhaps, no follower. These are his words:

(i) 'The Gospels of St. Luke, St. John, and St. Mark evidently have been translated directly from the Greek.' (ii) 'This Syriac text of the Gospel of St. Matthew which I now publish has, to a large extent, retained the identical terms and expressions which the Apostle himself employed; we have here, in our Lord's discourses, to a great extent the very same words as the Divine Author of our holy religion himself uttered in proclaiming the glad tidings of salvation in the Hebrew dialect.'<sup>1</sup>

(iii) Of the *Four Gospels* he writes:

'It seems to be scarcely possible that the Syriac text published by Widmanstadt, could be altogether a different version from this. . . . The more cultivated and improved edition [is] the result of revision and correction from a fresh collation with the original Greek. . . . The language, also, of the four Gospels in the Peshitto has undergone some modification from this text' (p. lxx).

The first of these propositions few would dispute; but, as the second has found favour with none, the view that three of these Syriac Gospels are translations may now be extended and include all four. The third proposition, that there is a relation between the *Peshitto* and the *Curetonian Fragments* is indisputable; it is only on the nature of that relation that controversy can arise.

The title of the edition of the text which Mrs. Lewis discovered is correct as a simple statement of the contents of the manuscript. Mr. Burkitt, in the *Guardian*, recognizes the differences between the palimpsest and the Curetonian, and quotes them by name, employing 'Syr. vt.' to designate the archetypal text which is the foundation of each. The term 'Syr. vt.' is borrowed from Dr. Hort, and, with the term, that writer's views of the relation of the *Peshitto* as a *Versio Syriaca Vulgata* to an older *Versio Syriaca Vetus*. Yet Dr. Hort is not the only authority on Syriac versions. We may refer the reader to Scrivener, whose views have been repeated

<sup>1</sup> Preface, pp. lxxviii, xciii.

in each edition of his *Introduction*, and to the writer in *Studia Biblica*, whom we have already named. We are not aware that the arguments of the latter have ever been refuted, and it would be unreasonable to expect Mr. Burkitt to make the attempt within the compass of a contribution to the *Guardian*. But we ask him to recognize that there is another side to the question. We do not admit that his view of the relation of the Peshitto to an older text is to be regarded as a postulate in the New Testament criticism.<sup>1</sup> To the name given to the palimpsest itself we object, because *Codex Sinaiticus* has already been taken, and is even used by Mrs. Lewis (p. xxvii), as the recognized name of the Greek MS. known as  $\aleph$ . Although we employ in this article the adjectives 'Curetonian' and 'Sinaitic,' we hope the palimpsest will hereafter be known as the *Codex Ludovicus*.

The value of an ancient manuscript, speaking generally, and without reference to special features of orthography or details of text, which may enhance the interest of particular codices, depends upon the contents and the antiquity in relation to one another. In spite of views which now prevail in some quarters, we maintain that for literary and critical purposes a manuscript which contains a carelessly written and corrupted text has not been purged of its offences by lapse of years, and that a copy which seems to represent more faithfully the original autograph is not necessarily discredited because it is young. At the same time, in the absence of criteria whereby the character of the contents may be tested, the antiquity of a manuscript would always raise a presumption in its favour; but where both can be considered, text and age together must determine the value of the codex.

Reference has already been made to Mr. Burkitt's opinion that the version which the palimpsest contains has been transmitted in a much purer form than that which the Curetonian exhibits. Mrs. Lewis,<sup>2</sup> after noticing some of the most interesting readings of her codex, says: 'Some of these readings indicate a greater antiquity for the Sinai manuscript than for Cureton's. But, on the other hand, there are a few expressions which may point to a later origin.' And a little below she continues: 'Dr. Nestle, of Ulm, and Mr. Rendel Harris have both expressed the opinion that it represents, not a duplicate of the Curetonian, but the very first attempt at rendering the Gospel into Syriac, of which Tatian and the Curetonian are both revisions.' It appears, therefore, that the

<sup>1</sup> See *Revision Revised*, pp. 275-7, where the writers' criticisms express the views of Hort's opponents.

<sup>2</sup> *Translation*, Introduction, pp. xxxi-ii.

editor  
hesita  
MS. a  
that '  
with t  
that t  
to the  
their  
Sinait  
believ  
beginn  
than C  
Museu  
A.D. 4  
codex  
of the  
article  
centur  
'We c  
must h  
saints  
might  
impris  
meant,  
univers  
least s  
stolic t

Tw  
the ed  
without  
to exp  
graphe  
the lea  
as of t  
particu  
decisio  
content  
belong  
Mr. Bu  
of Estr  
presenc

<sup>1</sup> P.

<sup>2</sup> No  
'Theoph

<sup>3</sup> See

<sup>4</sup> Gu



editors, though not without a slight but not reprehensible hesitation, are prepared to assign to the text of the Lewis MS. a very great antiquity. Mr. Burkitt (*loc.*) justly remarks that 'the date of a manuscript is a small thing compared with the date of the text which it presents;' but it is clear that the editors are also disposed to assign a very early date to the codex itself, and thus to find some further support to their view of the relative antiquity of the Curetonian and Sinaitic texts. In her *Introduction* Mrs. Lewis writes: <sup>1</sup> 'I believe that the transcribers are willing to assign it to the beginning of the fifth century, that is, to an earlier period than Cureton's, or any other Syriac manuscript in the British Museum.' One of these manuscripts is dated A.Gr. 723 = A.D. 412.<sup>2</sup> We conclude that the transcribers agreed that the codex was written not later than some year in the first decade of the fifth century. Mr. Burkitt goes further, for in his article in the *Guardian* he says, 'it may very likely be half a century earlier.' A little lower down Mrs. Lewis writes: 'We observe from the final colophon that the manuscript must have been written at a period when prayer for departed saints had become a recognized custom.' By this test we might date the manuscript in the year of St. Paul's second imprisonment.<sup>3</sup> Though this is not the date Mrs. Lewis meant, yet she would doubtless concur in the opinion, almost universally held amongst scholars, that a Syriac version of at least some part of the New Testament was made in sub-apostolic times.

Two photographic illustrations of pages are prefixed to the edition of the text, but they are in reduced size; and, without access to the manuscript itself, it is hazardous to express an opinion on the age of the writing. The palæographer has to take account of the quality and substance of the leaves, of the colour and appearance of the pages, as well as of the general character of the hand and the shapes of particular letters, before he feels justified in pronouncing a decision on the date of the codex before him. We must now content ourselves with observing that the hand appears to belong to the era of the earliest with which we are acquainted. Mr. Burkitt <sup>4</sup> speaks of the hand as that 'of the earliest type of Estrangela.' He also appears to be influenced by the presence of some unusual grammatical forms; but these may

<sup>1</sup> P. xxxi.

<sup>2</sup> No. DCCXXVI., containing translations of the 'Recognitions,' 'Theophania,' 'Palestine Martyrs,' &c.

<sup>3</sup> See the prayer for the deceased Onesiphorus in 2 Tim. i. 18.

<sup>4</sup> *Guardian*, p. 1707.

be dialectic. Mr. Gwilliam<sup>1</sup> has called attention to the statement of Mrs. Lewis, that the vellum was once stout, as indicating a later rather than a very early period.<sup>2</sup> We should certainly like to know what are the grounds for the opinion that the Sinaitic MS. is at least sixty years, and perhaps a hundred years, older than Cureton's.<sup>3</sup> In the problems which are now before us every detail of the evidence is important; yet the actual date of Mrs. Lewis's codex is not essential to any part of our main contention. Both her manuscript and Cureton's are copies of earlier manuscripts, and represent recensions, of which the original exemplars have perished, as far as we know. The editors are not able to tell us from the manuscript by whom or where it was written. A final column, which probably contains the information, is illegible, and this is to be regretted. In tracing the history of the Curetonian-Sinaitic texts, it would be helpful to know in what locality those types prevailed. It is suggested, on apparently good grounds, that the leaves were in the Sinai library when they were used for the eighth-century writing.<sup>4</sup>

The ancient codex, to which these leaves belonged, contained the Four Gospels from the first verse of St. Matthew to the last of St. John; St. Mark and St. Luke being placed in the familiar order. There are, however, many lacunæ, in consequence of the impossibility of reading the underlying writing in those places, and several leaves are wanting, which the scribe of the upper writing did not take from the original volume. The first page of St. Matthew is transcribed on the verso of the leaf. The editors say that the recto is blank. The want of a title to the whole work is compensated by the colophons to the several Gospels; and it is not probable, on the analogy of other Syriac Biblical manuscripts of the same size and similar antiquity, that the original volume contained more than the Gospels. The leaf which contained the colophon to St. Matthew is lost. At St. Mark xvi. 8 we have: *Here endeth the Evangelium of Markos . . . Evangelium of Luka*. Similar words conclude St. Luke and head St. John. Lastly we have: *Here endeth the Gospel* (*sing.* not *pl.*)

<sup>1</sup> *Expository Times*, January 1895, p. 157, referring to *Syriac Gospels*, Introduction, p. vi.

<sup>2</sup> See Gardthausen, *Griechische Paläographie*, p. 41; Scrivener, *Introduction*, 4th ed., i. 23; Maunde Thompson, *Greek and Latin Palaeography*, p. 38.

<sup>3</sup> The age of this manuscript is not uncertain. Wright, a great authority, assigned it to A.D. 450-70. See for this, and the Syriac versions generally, his *Short History of Syriac Literature*, pp. 10, 11.

<sup>4</sup> *Introduction*, pp. xvi, xvii.

of the  
Amer  
with  
Meph  
it is a  
confir  
his m  
Th  
strikin  
Anoth  
Mark  
of mu  
the wh  
differ  
in St.  
in ver  
the nu  
Greek  
an ite  
his Sy  
but no  
It is u  
St. Ma  
the Sir  
after x  
Mr  
(with  
text a  
nexion  
places  
in both  
are co  
similari  
the fir  
marked  
ton MS  
ii. 2, C  
12, CS  
each 'F  
12 and  
common  
<sup>1</sup> Op.  
<sup>2</sup> It is  
MSS. T  
<sup>3</sup> Syr

of the ܡܦܠܫܐ (*Mēpharrēshē*) four books. *Glory to God, &c., Amen.* The editors read the word which follows 'Gospel' with the *ribbui*, i.e. in the plural; and, whatever the term *Mepharresha* may signify, of which we shall have more to say, it is applied in the Lewis MS. to the whole work, and is not confined to St. Matthew, as Cureton believed was the case in his manuscript.

The arrangement of the books in the familiar order is a striking difference between the Curetonian and Sinaitic texts. Another difference is the omission of the conclusion of St. Mark from the latter. The former has now, in consequence of mutilation, only vv. 17-20; without doubt it once contained the whole of the traditional ending. A third and very obvious difference between the two codices is found in the genealogy in St. Matthew. In the Curetonian three names are inserted in ver. 8, Ahaziah, Joash, Amaziah; while curiously enough, the number *fourteen*, which is the sum of the names in the Greek copies, is not changed in ver. 17. This insertion was an item in the evidence adduced by Cureton for connecting his Syriac text of St. Matthew with an Aramaic original;<sup>1</sup> but no such insertion is found in the Sinaitic palimpsest. It is unfortunate that folio 28 of the palimpsest, containing St. Matt. xx. 24-xxi. 20 is lost, so that we do not know if the Sinaitic had the addition which is found in the Curetonian after xx. 28.<sup>2</sup>

Mrs. Lewis remarks<sup>3</sup> that 'it is important to observe' (with Mr. Harris) 'that the division into paragraphs in our text and in the Cureton MS. is often identical.' This connexion between the two manuscripts may exist in several places; it may be true, on the whole, that the text is divided in both on similar principles; but we cannot infer that both are copies in this respect of an archetypal exemplar, for similarity of textual division does not exist throughout. Take the first five chapters of St. Matthew. Paragraphs are marked as follows: i. 11, Sinaitic MS.; 16, Sinaitic and Cureton MSS.; 17, S (blank line), C; 23, C not S; 25 as 17; ii. 2, C; 13, C; 15, C; 18, S (half line); 21, C; 23 C; iii. 12, CS; 17, S; iv. 11, CS; 16, C; 20, C; 24, S; v. 2, CS. At each 'Beatitude' a break is made in both manuscripts, also at 12 and 42 in S, and at 47 in C, with some other paragraphs common to both. Part of chap. v. is wanting in S. Some of

<sup>1</sup> *Op. cit.* Preface, pp. vii-xi.

<sup>2</sup> It is found also in D and in many Old Latin and some Vulgate MSS. The words are given by Sanday, *op. cit.*

<sup>3</sup> *Syriac Gospels*, Introduction, p. xx.

these identical paragraphs are necessarily so marked in any division of the text with reference to the subject matter; and we suspect that others which Mrs. Lewis might cite as examples of outward resemblance between the codices have not the significance which at first sight they seem to possess. It may perhaps be thought that some of the paragraphs in C and S are connected with the division of the text into the 'Ammonian Sections,' as they are notated in Syriac MSS. These Sections are not given in any printed Syriac New Testament, but in the specimen of text in *The Materials for the Criticism of the Peshitto New Testament*,<sup>1</sup> St. Matt. v. 31-48, the Sections and Canons are marked in the margin, and are far more numerous than the divisions of C and S in the same passage. The writer of *The Materials* informs us (p. 81) that the text is often interrupted in the best manuscripts, and refers in a note to several systems of division.

But while an occasional, or even frequent, coincidence of paragraphs does not, in our opinion, prove relationship, clear evidence of the connexion between our two manuscripts is afforded by the special and peculiar readings in particular passages. One occurs in the verses which we are about to examine in detail. At Matt. xx. 11 both C and S read *When they saw for When they received*. Cureton *in loco* explains the difference through a confusion between ܐܠܗܝܬܐ (hzy) and ܐܠܗܝܬܐ (ahzy), remarking that in his manuscript ܐ (aleph) before ܠ (heth) is not unfrequently lost. However this may be, the reading was established before the transcription of either C or S. Another curious coincidence is at Luke xxiv. 32. For the Greek *καιομένη*, the Curetonian has *heavy*, and the editor supposed 'a mistake of the scribe confounding ܠܝܬܐ (rish) 'with ܠܝܬܐ (dolath);' but ܠܝܬܐ (ykîr) is also found in the Sinaitic palimpsest. At John xiv. 22 the Curetonian has the interesting reading *Judas Thomas* for 'Ιούδας, οὐχ ὁ Ἰσκαριώτης, but the Sinaitic reads, 'Thomas saith to Him.'

There is one reading which seems to be peculiar to the Lewis codex, and which demands full consideration, not on the present occasion because of its theological importance, but for the light it may throw on the history of the codex. The character of the version cannot be disregarded in the attempt to fix its true place in relation to other Syriac translations of the Gospels. On the first page of the manuscript we find

<sup>1</sup> *Studia Biblica*, vol. iii. and see 'The Ammonian Sections,' &c., in vol. ii.

the wo  
begat

Va  
reading  
Lord.

Academ  
some o  
St. Ma  
failed,  
ingenio  
that the  
which  
differen  
sition to  
Mrs. Le  
not the  
be expl

The  
passage  
not be  
fore inc  
the pec  
of our I  
Gospels,  
general  
hibit the  
the view  
great pa  
the open  
nunciatio  
tive of S  
known d

<sup>1</sup> Acad  
alluded to  
St. Matthe  
genealogy  
grand and

<sup>2</sup> Contes

<sup>3</sup> A Tr

<sup>4</sup> Matt.

(<sup>6</sup> Mary his  
was called  
viii. 57 ('Be  
in God hath  
in other pla  
Mark xvi. 9

<sup>5</sup> In Ma

VOL. X

the words, 'Joseph, to whom was betrothed Mary the Virgin, begat (Δεσ) Jesus, who is called the Christ.'

Various ways have been proposed of dealing with a reading that concerns so intimately the Incarnation of our Lord. An attempt made from the orthodox side in the *Academy*<sup>1</sup> to remove the passage entirely by supposing, with some confirmation from *k* and other Old-Latin MSS., that St. Matthew's Gospel originally began at v. 18, has naturally failed, and, as we understand, has been withdrawn by its ingenious and fertile author. Mr. Rendel Harris suspects that the form of this verse belongs to 'a non-Catholic text, in which Joseph was represented as the husband of Mary in a different sense from the Catholic acceptance,' and in opposition to 'the accepted and almost universal Greek tradition.'<sup>2</sup> Mrs. Lewis pleads that the version, when taken as a whole, is not the work of a heretic, and that this peculiar reading must be explained upon some other hypothesis.<sup>3</sup>

There might be some colour in Mrs. Lewis's plea if the passage stood alone, even though its literal meaning could not be justified, the verb being in the masculine, and therefore incapable of referring to anyone except St. Joseph. But the peculiar readings found both in the rest of the account of our Lord's Birth in St. Matthew, and in other parts of the Gospels,<sup>4</sup> prove the verse in question to be only a portion of a general attempt made in the version in this manuscript to exhibit the Incarnation of our Lord under a different aspect from the view given in all other manuscripts. When we turn to the great passages which might correct such an inference, such as the openings of St. John and St. Mark, the account of the Annunciation in St. Luke, the close of St. Matthew, the narrative of St. Peter's confession in the same Gospel, and well-known detached expressions,<sup>5</sup> we find that parts of the text

<sup>1</sup> *Academy*, December 1, 1894, and following numbers. The marks alluded to as found in some MSS. meant that the *reading part* of St. Matthew's Gospel for lectionary and other purposes began after the genealogy thus separated in a preliminary section, but also being the grand and inalienable commencement of the Gospel.

<sup>2</sup> *Contemporary Review*, November 1894, p. 665.

<sup>3</sup> *A Translation of the Four Gospels*, Introduction, pp. xxiii-xxv.

<sup>4</sup> Matt. i. 21, 25; xiii. 55 ('Son of Joseph'); xxiv. 36; Luke ii. 5 ('Mary his wife,' omitting μεμνησενμένη); iii. 23 ('being according as He was called the Son of Joseph'); John iii. 13 ('Who is from Heaven'); viii. 57 ('Before Abraham was, I have been'); vi. 47 ('He that believeth in God hath life'); vi. 59. Also omission of μονογενης in John iii. 18, and in other places, and omission of the Ascension in Luke xxiv. 51, and in Mark xvi. 9-20.

<sup>5</sup> In Mark v. 27-vi. 5; John v. 26-45; xvi. 26-28; xviii. 32-xix. 39.

are lost. There are also evident traces of Gnosticism. Immediately after His Baptism our Lord is called 'the chosen one of God,' instead of 'the Son of God,'<sup>1</sup> 'My Son and My beloved,'<sup>2</sup> the Holy Ghost 'abode upon Him,' and later on He is addressed from Heaven, 'This is My Son the chosen,' i.e. out of the rest of mankind.<sup>3</sup> At His death we read, 'And Jesus cried with a loud voice, and *His spirit went up.*'<sup>4</sup> A Gnostic interpretation is also probably to be affixed to the expressions in the latter part of the first chapter of St. Matthew, which at first sight seem to be inconsistent with a tenet of the human paternity of Joseph. As we read, 'When they had not come near one to the other, she was found with child of the Holy Ghost' (v. 18), and 'He who is born from her' (ܡܠܟܐ; cf. ii. 2) is of the Holy Ghost' (v. 20), we must bear in mind that, according to a Gnostic tenet, the soul and body were so separated that the former might be held to come possibly from the Holy Ghost and the body from a human father.

Our view of the character of the text preserved in Mrs. Lewis's codex is confirmed by the later history of the manuscript itself. In such a monastery as that of St. Catherine it could hardly have been doomed to furnish vellum for lives of saints if it had been a work of high repute. There is something suspicious in the evident traces of determined destruction of the manuscript. Seventeen leaves have disappeared,<sup>5</sup> which doubtless would not be a remarkable phenomenon but that they include some of the leading doctrinal *τόποι* in the Gospels. Many parts have been rendered, as if intentionally, undecipherable. On one, at least, a knife was used to eradicate the writing. Is it too much to infer that the manuscript was condemned on the score of its heretical record?

The use of the epithet *Mepharresha* in both the Curetonian and the Sinaitic MSS. suggests a connexion in origin; and such was undoubtedly the case, in spite of the great and obvious as well as the more minute divergences of the one from the other. It is well known that the Curetonian text in many places differs considerably from the language of the Peshitto version, although it is identical with it in other passages. The Sinaitic form of text is of similar character, but where it differs from the Curetonian the change is not always an approximation to the Peshitto. In illustration,

<sup>1</sup> John i. 34.<sup>2</sup> Matt. iii. 17; Luke iii. 22; Mark ix. 7.<sup>3</sup> Luke ix. 35.<sup>4</sup> Matt. xxvii. 50.<sup>5</sup> *The Four Gospels in Syriac*, Introduction, p. xix.

we ha  
in bo  
only  
harm  
chos  
ence  
and t  
corru  
as it  
giving  
can be  
case w  
togeth

1. B  
house, v  
yard.

S om

(*tsaphra*)  
three tin

2. A  
for one l  
P Bu  
a denar o

3. An  
in the str  
SP w

4. An  
which is

S om

ܡܠܟܐ  
(*etel*); P

occurrenc  
the preced

S om.

5. And  
likewise di

S om.

words of t

6. And  
standing, a

day?

<sup>1</sup> From  
full collecti  
1-16 except



we have sought for a passage which is extant in its entirety in both manuscripts, of sufficient length, and occurring in only one Gospel, so as to be free from the corruptions of harmonizing tendencies. St. Matt. xx. 1-16, which we have chosen, is so entirely undogmatic in character that no difference of reading between the Curetonian (C), the Sinaitic (S), and the Peshitto (P) can possibly be due either to heretical corruption or to orthodox emendation. We quote the passage as it stands in Cureton's translation, with a few alterations, giving the differences of reading in S and P,<sup>1</sup> as far as these can be expressed in English; but the full statement of the case will only be apparent when the passages are compared together in the Syriac.

St. Matthew xx. 1-16.

1. But like is the kingdom of heaven to a man, the lord of a house, which went out in the morning to hire labourers for his vineyard.

S om. *but*, P *for*. *Morning* in CS ܡܫܬܪܐ (*shaphra*), in P ܡܫܬܪܐ (*tsaphra*), which form P commonly employs, but has ܡܫܬܪܐ (*shaphra*) three times. P ܡܫܬܪܐ (*d'negur*) *that he might hire*.

2. And he agreed with them, with the labourers, from one denar for one labourer on one day, and sent them to his vineyard.

P *But he*, and om. *with them*; S om. *with the labourers*. P *from a denar on the day*.

3. And he went out at three hours, and saw others, while standing in the street, and idle.

SP *who (were) standing*.

4. And he said to them; Go also ye to the vineyard, and that which is right I will give to you. And they went.

S om. *And*. *Right*, CP ܡܫܬܪܐ ܕܡܪܝܬܐ (*v'medem d'vole*), S ܡܫܬܪܐ ܕܡܪܝܬܐ (*v'ma d'zodek*), with identical meaning. *give*, CS ܐܬܬܐ (*ettel*); P ܐܬܬܐ (*yohe'b'no*), a verb of somewhat more frequent occurrence in the N.T.; but the meaning is the same, and this and the preceding change, on whichever side made, seem arbitrary.

S om. *And they went*; P *So those went*.

5. And he went out again at six hours, and at nine hours, and likewise did.

S om. *hours* alt. loc., P om. pr. loc., and transposes the last two words of the verse.

6. And he went out at eleven hours, and found others while standing, and said to them, Why are ye standing and idle all the day?

<sup>1</sup> From *Nov. Test. Syr. c. Vers. Lat. cura Leusden et Schaaf*. In the full collection of *Varr. Lectt.* Schaaf has noted nothing in Matt. xx. 1-16 except two variations of spelling.

S *and saw others who were standing, he said . . .* P *And about eleven hours he went out, and found others who were standing and idle. S ye standing here.* P trs. *all the day and idle.*

7. They say to him, No man hath hired us. He saith to them, Go also ye to the vineyard: and that which is just I will give to you.

Here C has ܡܠܬܐ ܕܙܕܝܩܐ (*v'ma d'zodek*) as S ver. 4. S *my vineyard* ܕܠܝ (*dili*) and om. remainder of ver. P *Because no man . . .* P ܡܠܬܐ ܕܡܕܡܐ (*v'medem d'vole*) as ver. 4; *ye shall receive.*

8. And when it was evening, the lord of the vineyard said to the master of his house, Call those labourers, and give to them their hire, and he began from the last until the first.

P But when it; S And when also it. S And begin (imperat.) P even until.

9. But when those came who [were hired] at eleven hours, they received a denar, a denar (C ܕܢܝܢܐ, SP ܕܢܝܢܐ, and so ver. 10).

S *And when.* P *And there came those.* Those; S has the common form ܚܘܢܐ (*honun*) with P, where C has the very rare ܚܘܠܘܬܐ (*holuc*).

10. And when the first came, they were supposing that to them he would give more; and they also received a denar, a denar.

P They supposed that they [should] receive more. 'Receive;' in CS ܢܫܐ (*nsab*), in P bis ܫܠܐ (*shkal*); the former *capere*, the latter *tollere*, but they are used interchangeably. P has a transposition in the last clause, which emphasizes the *they also*.

11. And when they saw, they murmured against the lord of the house,

S *But when; they murmur.* P *And when they received.*

12. And say to him, These last one hour have cultivated, and thou hast made them equal with us, which have borne the burden of all the day, and the heat.

SP om. *to him.* S 'tis *one hour they have . . .* S om. *and before thou.* S om. *all; S in the heat.* 'Cultivated,' P *worked.* P *the burden of the day and the heat thereof.*

13. But he answered and said to one of them, My friend, do not wrong me; was it not for a denar thou agreedst with me?

P *comrade*, but in usage the terms in P and CS differ little. *Wrong*; Cureton translates, *do not trouble me*, comparing the Peshitto of Luke xi. 7; but 'wrong' suits S better. S *I do not wrong thee*; P (stronger) *I do not act wickedly in thy case.* S *I agreed with thee.*

14. Take thine own, and go; and if I wish that I should give to this last, as to thee,

S *Take up thy denar,* ܫܠܐ *shkal*, as P in ver. 10; S *but if I . . .* P *but I wish that I . . .*


15. Am I not authorized that I should do with mine own that which I wish? Or why is thine eye evil, because I am good?

PS  
S  
identific  
C as w  
Tr  
16.  
are the  
SP

If  
text a  
results  
5 time  
times—  
found,  
state o  
between  
the for  
in this  
differen  
altoget  
C and  
the inf  
2 C an  
the dif  
received  
ment in  
that in  
C and S  
St. Ma  
given, h  
between  
bination  
give us  
in Syri  
St. Mat  
agreeme  
two tex  
reads 'a  
'and wh  
has ܫܠܐ  
besides  
But the  
varia le  
fully writ






PS om. *why*; Cureton has neglected it in his translation.

S slightly varies the Syriac of this verse, but the meaning is identical. Mrs. Lewis's alternative 'within my own' applies to P and C as well as S, and is permissible.

Translate P *Or it is not lawful to me . . .* but the same Syriac word  (*shalit*) is used in PCS.

16. So shall be the last first, and the first shall be last; for many are the called, and few the chosen.

SP om. 2nd *shall be*, om. *for*.

If we sum up the variations between the three forms of text as we have set them out above, we obtain the following results: S differs from C 30 times—25 times it stands alone, 5 times it is supported by P. The latter differs from C 32 times—5 times in combination with S. Yet here, as is often found, mere figures do not convey a perfect expression of the state of the case. There seems to be as great a divergence between the Curetonian and the Sinaitic as there is between the former and the Peshitto. But the divergences, at least in this passage, are of different kinds. In verse 1 the trifling differences of *but* or *for*, or the omission of the particle altogether, are more than balanced by the combination of C and S in reading  (*shaphra*) against the   (*tsaphra*), the infinitive *to hire* against the subjunctive of P. In verse 2 C and S agree in amplifying the shorter text of P. Again, the different readings *ye shall receive* (ver. 7) and *when they received* (ver. 11) are peculiar to P, C and S being in agreement in those places. On the other hand, it must be admitted that in verse 13 there are some remarkable differences between C and S. It may perhaps be said that our example from St. Matthew xx., which we chose for the reasons already given, has shown the differences which undoubtedly abound between C and S and P altogether, and in their various combinations, with an excess of illustration. Mrs. Lewis shall give us the opposite side. In the Introduction to the *Gospels in Syriac*, § 4, she enumerates twenty passages, all taken from St. Matthew and St. Luke, in which there is 'a line for line agreement.' For a test we may take Luke vii. 34-38. The two texts C and S are not absolutely identical. In verse 35 S reads '*all her children*.' In verse 37 S has '*while he was*,' C '*and while*,' S '*and when she*,' C '*when she*.' In verse 36 C has  (*P'vothek*) *apud eum*, S  (*ameh*) *cum eo*, besides a few other trifling differences in the other verses. But the text of the two passages is the same, with only such *variae lectiones* as are found on comparing even the most carefully written copies of an ancient author. Now if we compare

S with the Peshitto we find at least twenty-one differences—omission or insertion of particles, change of order, change of terms, difference of expression. P has the *all* in verse 35, which C omits. Further evidence for the connexion between the texts of C and S may be elicited from Cureton's Preface. In a note on p. lxx he gives a long list of places where there is some interesting difference between the Peshitto and his text. S, if extant, usually sides with C against P. Down to the first large lacuna in S (St. Matt. vi.) there are twenty-seven differences noted between C and P. In eighteen of these S is almost, or quite, identical with C. Such facts are conclusive. The Curetonian and Sinaitic belong to a class of manuscripts which, for some reason, have preserved a different text from that of the Peshitto, unless there are ancient Peshitto MSS. with readings widely different from the printed text. But if we may accept the statements of those who possess first-hand knowledge of the facts we need not suspect that such is the case.<sup>1</sup>

In further comparison of the texts, we subjoin a passage of a different character, and from another Gospel. We here set out the Peshitto first, using as much as possible the language of Mrs. Lewis's translation of the Sinaitic.

St. Luke ix. 51.

51. And it was that when the days of his assumption were fulfilled, he prepared<sup>2</sup> his face that he should go to Jerusalem.

C om. *that bef. when*, S *And when*. CS *his going up*; both words are referred to the same root, but the form in CS is more general, that in P is often used of the Ascension into Heaven. 'Go,' C idiomatically, ܐܠܗܝܬܐ (*d'nēzal leh*), cf. Luc. viii. 37 in P—a sign of grammatical revision, and therefore later date.

52. And he sent messengers before his face; and they went, entered into a village of the Samaritans, so that they might prepare for him.

CS *he was sending*, P the aorist, as the Greek. S *and they came and entered*. C *one* [a certain] *village*; an emendation for readers unacquainted with Palestine. P = S, and might mean *the village of the Samaritans*. CS om. *so*.

53. And they did not receive him, because his face to Jerusalem was set to go.

<sup>1</sup> See *Studia Biblica*, i. 153, iii. 73, 85-87, 154, 161.

<sup>2</sup> 'Prepared' is read by CS and P. We note this for the guidance of the reader, because Mrs. Lewis, in pursuance of her plan (Introduction, p. xxxii), frequently quotes 'Cureton' in the margin when P, which is not quoted, also agrees with her Sinaitic text.

In ver. 52 she does not express the readings we note, but has 'sent . . . they went.'

C *receive them*; one of C's peculiar and unsupported readings;<sup>1</sup> an accommodation to the sense of the preceding verse. The position of *Jerusalem* in CSP is against the Greek, while it is not required by the Syriac idiom. It is a Syriac reading.

54. And when James and John his disciples saw, they say to him, Our Lord, wilt thou that we say, and there shall come down fire from heaven and consume them, as also Elias did?

CS ܐܝܬܗ ܕܥܝܢܐ (v'cad den) = et quum autem. 'Saw,' Mrs. Lewis inserts 'this,' and remarks that *unto him* is in Cur.; it is also in P. CS trs. *his disciples James and John*. CS they said. 'And there . . . ' a harsh construction which in CS is modified to ܕܐܬܗ ܕܥܝܢܐ (d'thehuth), like the εἰπωμεν τῷ καταβῆναι. CS om. the last clause 'as also . . .'; they agree with one Greek reading, P with another.

55. And he turned and rebuked them, and said; . . . C, ܐܬܗ ܕܥܝܢܐ (v'hu) *And he himself* . . . said to them.

56. Ye know not . . . but to save; P and C, but S om. And . . . village; PCS.

C has ∴ after the verse, but not S; another instance of difference in marking paragraphs.

57. And as they go in the way, a man said to Him, I will come after thee, whithersoever [*lit.* to the place that] thou goest, My Lord.

C *there came a certain man, said to Him*. 'Man'; SP here, and ver. 62 CSP, ܐܢܫܐ (ānosh), here C ܓܒܪܐ (gebra); the former is *homo*, the latter *vir*. CS om. *My Lord*.

58. Saith Jesus to him, The foxes have holes, and the birds of heaven nests; but the Son of Man hath not where that he may lean his head.

S *verily*<sup>2</sup> the foxes. 'Nests'; in S ܡܝܬܐ (kenne), the proper term, but without *ribbui*; the word in PC (ܡܝܬܐ) is also used of a tent, &c.

C and the Son. 'Where' CS a *place that*.

Without going into details, it will suffice to note that inferences may be drawn from the verses above similar to those we drew from the former passage. The Peshitto, the Curetonian, and the Sinaitic are connected with one another through the possession of much common matter. The relation of C to S is a subject for an interesting inquiry, but it does not fall within the scope of the present article. Minute details of resemblance and difference between these codices do not affect the main parts of our argument.<sup>3</sup> In treating of the text of

<sup>1</sup> See the list in Baethgen's *Evangelienfragmente*, pp. 32-35. Many are now to be found also in S.

<sup>2</sup> 'Verily' (ܐܝܢܐ); we take the form which Mrs. Lewis thus translates, as ܕ (d) = ὅτι recitantis and ܐܝܢܐ ēn = sane; see Dr. Payne Smith's *Thesaur. Syriac.* 250 mid.

<sup>3</sup> As the two texts resemble one another so greatly, many passages

the Syriac Gospels a more important question is, what is the relation of the Peshitto to the other forms of text? Cureton has stated the case from his point of view.<sup>1</sup> We presume his arguments would be allowed by those who accept his conclusions. They apply to the case of the Sinaitic as much, or as little, as they did to Cureton's text. We will consider his chief points:

(i) He gives a large number of passages where, in his opinion, the translator misunderstood the Greek, and has been corrected in the Peshitto. Granting that this is so, how would he then account for the passages, some of which we have noted, where the Curetonian, or the Sinaitic, or both, are better representations of the Greek than the Peshitto is? Thus one inference is neutralized by another.

(ii) He remarks on the number of Greek terms which are retained in the Curetonian in contrast with the proper Syriac expressions, which are found in the Peshitto. The value of this argument may be estimated by a reference to the texts of the Philoxenian and Harkleian Versions. Macaulay's (Syriac) schoolboy knows that these abound in Græcisms. Are they then anterior to the Peshitto? Historically, we know that they are not; and this is a fact by which we can weigh Dr. Cureton's theory.

(iii) Much is made of looseness of rendering, ignorance of the niceties of the Greek, &c. Be it so; but what shall be said of the harmonizing renderings, the exegetical translations, the doctrinal alterations, which also abound? If loose rendering be a mark of antiquity, the other marks are those of a later age.

(iv) Certain archaic forms, which are read in the Curetonian text, have been supposed to be indications of its antiquity.<sup>2</sup> Such forms are also found in the Sinaitic. They afford no data for comparison of the Curetonian-Sinaitic and the Peshitto as *texts*; they only indicate that the Peshitto was printed from manuscripts of a more recent epoch than that to which C and S belong.<sup>3</sup> We have already seen that

indeed in the one being practically identical with the same places in the other, it will suffice to refer to Baethgen, whose exhaustive commentary on the language and characteristics of the Curetonian will provide the reader with a criticism on the Sinaitic text. See *Evangelienfragmente*, Einleitung, 6-30.

<sup>1</sup> Preface, pp. lxviii-lxx.

<sup>2</sup> See Rödiger in the *Z. D. M. G.*, 1862, p. 550.

<sup>3</sup> This was recognized by Cureton in reference to purely grammatical forms—'the more antient the MSS. [of the Pesh.] be, the more nearly do they correspond in this respect with [the Curetonian];' *op. cit.* lxxiii.



Pusey (one of the few able to speak from first-hand knowledge) recognized that about the beginning of the eighth century, the Peshitto codices were subjected to a certain amount of grammatical revision. This we should have expected, considering the labours of the Massoretes and others.<sup>1</sup> But this revision was limited in extent, and had no relation whatever to a reconstruction of the text, whether in the fourth or in any other century.

Space forbids a complete examination of the passages in which, as Cureton held, the Peshitto has undergone some modification from his text. His arguments would equally apply to the Sinaitic, as, in the majority of cases, the readings are the same. To show how little they really avail to establish Cureton's contention, we will criticize the first ten, St. Matt. i, ii., where S is also extant.

St. Matthew, i, ii.

i. 17. C *even unto David*, twice in the three times the expression occurs; so S, though Mrs. Lewis does not notice it. P om., and there is certainly no *καί* in the Greek; but the presence or absence of the *ο* (*v*) in a Syriac manuscript is a mere *var. lect.*, and not worth the editor's notice here. 18. P *before they associated*, altered in C to *when they had not come near one to the other*, in order, as it has seemed to us, to emphasize, by paraphrase, the fact of the virgin birth. We now find the same paraphrase in S, and this is remarkable, as it is inconsistent with the heretical alteration of verse 16, which, as now read in S, teaches that 'Joseph, to whom was betrothed Mary the Virgin, begat Jesus.' 19. CS *quietly to repudiate her* (Cur. *divorce*); P *privately to release her*, which, at least as regards the *λάβρα*, better represents the Greek. 20. The variations here mark three stages. P *in a dream*; C, exegetically, *in a vision* of the night; S om. *of the night*, either by error, or an approximation to the Greek. 25. P *and knew her not*; C *and purely was dwelling with her*, an expansion to emphasize the doctrinal teaching of the passage as in ver. 18. S, *and took his wife and she bore to him a son*, consistently with the translation in ver. 16. ii. 9. P *and behold the star*; CS *and there appeared to them the star*; in the latter part of the ver. CS differ from P, and from one another, in terms. The renderings of C and S are to make clear to the reader that the star reappeared, and what was the position it

<sup>1</sup> Such as Jacobus Edessenus († 710), Birkett, *Conspect. rei Syrr. Literariae*, pp. 11, 41. For a specimen of the work of the Massoretes see *Studia Biblica*, vol. iii. ('The Materials,' &c.), pp. 93-6.

took. 13. *And after them* CS. This is not a translation, but looks like a mere connexion between two incidents on the part of a writer, who here is describing rather than translating. P translates the Greek, *but when they had departed*. 16. CS *to the likeness of the time which those* (S om. *those*) *Magi had said to him*; P *according to the time which he inquired, etc.*; the former an exegesis, the latter literal. 22. For *ἀντὶ* P *pro*, CS *in loco*, which more plainly asserts the accession of the new ruler. 23. P *so that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet*; CS *and there was fulfilled the word, which was spoken by the prophet*. The latter rendering has a rationalizing tone, as though there was only a chance accommodation to ancient prediction in the event. P asserts plainly the Divine foreordaining of the course of the history.

The differences between PCS may thus be summarized: Unimportant 1, in i. 17; dogmatic changes 2, i. 18, ii. 23 in CS; exegeses 4, i. 20 in C, i. 25, ii. 9, 22 in CS; approximations to Greek 4, i. 20 in S, i. 19, ii. 13, 16 in P. And so on for the remainder of Cureton's list. It does not prove his contention. If P is often nearer the Greek and a better translation, C and S are loaded with exegeses and alterations, which are surely marks of a later age. Their texts are not genuine and primitive, but have been manipulated.

We write deliberately, not forgetting that in some quarters a different opinion has prevailed, and has been advocated by eminent writers. First, nearly a century ago Griesbach and Hug<sup>1</sup> thought they saw in the Syriac marks of revision, and that there had existed an Old Syriac as well as an Old Latin. This was an hypothesis. About forty years afterwards Cureton published his newly-found text. This was hastily dubbed 'an Old Syriac Codex,' and was held to confirm the hypothesis. A generation elapses, and Dr. Hort writes:

'Even this [the Curetonian] partially corrupted text is not only a valuable authority, but renders the comparatively late and "revised" character of the Syriac Vulgate a matter of certainty. The authoritative revision seems to have taken place either in the latter part of the third or in the fourth century.'

An hypothetical opinion, by means of a fact of dubious significance, is converted into a certainty, and an historical event, which the theory necessitates, is imagined to have occurred and assigned to a definite period. Now, since there is no historical record of such a revision, since in the copious remains of Syriac Christian literature no allusion even to

<sup>1</sup> See the quotation from Westcott and Hort's 'Greek Testament' in *Syriac Gospels*, Introd. p. xxii.

such an important undertaking has yet been traced, the evidence for this 'evidently authoritative revision' must be circumstantial, and can only be found in the conclusions which are necessarily to be inferred from the analogy of Jerome's work on the Vulgate and Old Latin, and from the characteristics of the Curetonian and Peshitto Texts, when seen in contrast to one another.

We have already shown that the opinion that the text of the Peshitto is the result of successive revisions is absolutely groundless. We have also shown that the variations of its text from the Curetonian are not to be described generally as attempts to improve the diction and approximate to the Greek. We have given examples sufficient to convince the unprejudiced reader that in a large number of passages the text of the Peshitto has been deliberately altered by the hands which produced the Curetonian and the Sinaitic texts or their archetypes.<sup>1</sup> It remains to inquire whether there is any real analogy between the Syriac texts, in their relation to one another, and the dependence of the Vulgate on the Old Latin Version.

The history of the recension in which the Vulgate was produced is well known. Both from St. Jerome's dedicatory Epistle to Pope Damasus, who entrusted him with the revision, and from St. Augustine's remarks in his *De Doctrina Christiana*, we learn that the need for revision was found in the disagreement with one another existing in the large number of Latin manuscripts. 'Tot sunt pæne [exemplaria] quot codices' was Jerome's description :<sup>2</sup> 'Latinorum interpretum infinita varietas,' 'interpretum numerositas,' 'nullo modo numerari possunt,'<sup>3</sup> were the words of the eloquent Augustine. The administrative instinct of the Roman Pontiff pointed towards a uniform use for those who conversed in the Latin tongue. Accordingly Damasus in the year 382 committed to St. Jerome, who was then at Rome, the office of comparing the various Old Latin texts with one another and with Greek manuscripts, and of producing a version which should bear the Pope's authority, and should also from its own intrinsic excellence be accepted universally among Latin Christians.

From the manuscripts which have come down to us we

<sup>1</sup> So at length Dr. Waller *ap.* Scrivener, *Textual Criticism*, 4th edn., vol. ii. pp. 21-24.

<sup>2</sup> *Epistola ad Damasum* ; see Wordsworth's *Evangelium secundum Matthæum*, p. 2.

<sup>3</sup> *De Doctrina Christiana*, ii. 11, 14.

know what several of those Latin texts were, and we are probably acquainted with the chief among them. Those which have survived range from *f* the Brescian MS., which is most like the Vulgate, and therefore has been supposed to be a representative of the 'Itala' recommended strongly by St. Augustine,<sup>1</sup> to *k* the Bobbian, which, being most like the quotations in Tertullian and Cyprian, has been taken to represent a class thence termed 'African.' But there are signs that the threefold division into 'Italian,' 'European,' and 'African' is not so much in favour as it once was. When worked out in detail it is found not to be so helpful as was anticipated. Tertullian seems to have made his own translations direct from the Greek, and he and St. Cyprian occupy pretty well the whole ground as the earliest Latin writers in the Church, and may therefore represent the entire Church of their time, or some large part of it instead of Africa alone. At all events there are no other contemporaneous writers to interfere with their authority, or to shed light with them upon early usage. Besides this, some of the manuscripts belong to more than one class, or shade off from one another with differences so imperceptible and so sporadic as to render such classifying difficult. Thus *q*, one of the treasures of Munich, is removed by Mr. H. J. White, after elaborate examination, from being the faithful colleague of *f* in the Italian class, for it is pronounced in view of the evidence to be more in agreement with the 'European' *b*; and 'the fact that *q*, if we take all its readings into consideration, cannot be classed with any one definite branch of the Old Latin family, but has come under the influence of every group in turn, may be considered to be established.'<sup>2</sup> The object of the present remarks is, not to enter into the questions relating to the origin and grouping of the Old Latin manuscripts, which are now before textual critics, but to exhibit in the field of the Four Gospels (for it is best now to confine attention to that) the manifold variation that existed in the texts from which the Vulgate was mainly constructed. The chief intermediaries between *f* and *k* are *h*, *c*, *b*, *g*<sup>2</sup>, *ff*<sup>2</sup>, *g*<sup>1</sup>, *l*, *i*, *a*, *ff*<sup>1</sup>, and *e*. From such Latin texts, including the comparison with Greek copies of the Gospels, as was directed by Damasus, and as is also evident in the results, St. Jerome made up the text of his Vulgate.

It is, therefore, clear that there were here both a need and a case for revision. Latin writers, previously to St. Jerome's work, must have been quoting inconsistently even to a greater

<sup>1</sup> *De Doctrina Christiana*, ii. 15.    <sup>2</sup> *Old Latin Biblical Texts*, iii. p. 1.

extent than we know, and the standard of reference was in confusion. But the parallel breaks down when we place the supposed Syriac revision side by side with the Latin. There is, in the latter instance, no trace of confusion, except between the Curetonian and the Lewis Codex, and these two are obscure documents both in their history and as to any prevalence of their use. No Damasus or Augustine are known in Syria in Ante-Nicene times; no complaint of perplexity because of conflicting texts has been heard from the first four centuries in those parts.<sup>1</sup> It is true that the fragment and the palimpsest varied from the Peshitto, but, according to all tradition and to all teaching before 1842, the last has kept its place from the time of its very early introduction in the unchangeable East. The contrast, therefore, between Syrian and Latin proceedings is manifest, and critics should be on their guard against being led by a parallel which turns out to be imaginary. And there is another contrast. The Latin Vulgate, in course of time, took the place of the numerous texts previously in vogue, but the Peshitto has ever reigned predominant so far as external history has testified from the time when, the veil being first raised, it was seen in possession upon the hills of the impenetrable past.

The argument from the analogy of the Latin versions is found to be fallacious, but appeal is made to the evidence of early Syriac writers,<sup>2</sup> to the translator of Eusebius *On the Theophania*, to the *Homilies of Aphraates*, to the *Acts of Judas Thomas*, and to Tatian's *Diatessaron*. 'It was observed,' says Mr. Burkitt, 'that the Gospel quotations in all these works presented a text allied to the Curetonian.' He had written before, 'The quotations found in Ephraim Syrus gave at best an uncertain sound.' We shall consider the important question of the text of the *Diatessaron* at greater length; of the other works, it must suffice to remind the reader that opinions are divided. Thus Wright<sup>3</sup> says 'Aphraates seems to have employed a text which Baethgen calls a slightly revised form of Sc [the Curetonian]; we would rather speak of it as a mixed form of the Old Syriac Gospels of the second

<sup>1</sup> The Greek recensions of Lucian, of Hesychius, and of Pierius, were chiefly of the Septuagint, though they included also the New Testament. Only Lucian was Asiatic. Though educated at Edessa, and afterwards at Antioch, there is no evidence of his having interfered with the Syriac translation of the Bible. Hesychius and Pierius were Egyptians.

<sup>2</sup> As by Mr. Burkitt, art. in *Guardian*, par. 2.

<sup>3</sup> *Op. cit.* p. 10, quoting Baethgen's *Evangelienfragmente*, p. 85. This monograph is indispensable, even to those who, like ourselves, do not accept the writer's opinions about the origin of the Peshitto.

century.' Again, 'Ephraim made use of a more thorough Edessene revision, closely approximating in form to, if not identical with, P.' Zahn and others have maintained that Aphraates quoted, not the 'Old Syriac,' but the *Diatessaron* of Tatian. The works of St. Ephraim have been carefully examined by Mr. Woods, who has published his conclusions in *Studia Biblica*, vol. iii. He says, 'The great bulk of Ephrem's quotations [are] those which are in exact or practical agreement with the Peshitto.'<sup>1</sup> This confirms Wright's view. In reference to the translations of *The Theophania* and of *Judas Thomas*, we are not concerned to dispute the statement that the translators made use of extra-Peshitto readings, but we dispute the inference which has been drawn from what is believed to have been their custom. If it be true that their renderings of Gospel quotations resemble the Curetonian-Sinaitic text rather than the Peshitto version, this would imply (a) either that the Greek they had to render was such Greek as underlies the Curetonian-Sinaitic, which needs no refutation; or (β) that the authors of those translations preferred the Syriac words which they used to those of the Peshitto.<sup>2</sup> Who those translators were, is unknown. To quote their practice as evidence of the custom of the Syriac Church at large is to contradict the official evidence afforded by the indisputable custom of St. Ephraim. On the whole, then, it cannot be denied that the Peshitto was a great and recognized version in the middle of the fourth century. There is no evidence that it was viewed with suspicion; no reason to suppose that Ephraim regarded it as a new work, although, according to the period supposed for the 'authoritative revision,' it had been published shortly before his birth, if not during his life, for he died about 370 A.D.

The *Diatessaron* of Tatian, both on account of the early date of the compiler,<sup>3</sup> and because some have held that it was the first attempt to render the Holy Gospels into Syriac, is of

<sup>1</sup> *Op. cit.* p. 116. For Aphraates see pp. 118, 119, and Rev. F. H. Woods in *Classical Review*, December 1889. See also *Church Quarterly Review* ('Tatian's *Diatessaron*'), January 1891, p. 348, and for Ephraim's citations pp. 358-9. If there is a connexion between C, S, and Tatian, it is not remarkable that Ephraim should sometimes cite C S readings.

<sup>2</sup> Bar-Bahlul cited the ܡܦܪܫܬܐ (*Mepharresha*) in the tenth century, and Bar-Salibi in the twelfth seems to refer to the Curetonian (*Thes. Syr.* Payne Smith, col. 579; Cureton, Preface, p. xi). Yet in the eighth century this text was so little esteemed that one of our codices was covered with other writings.

<sup>3</sup> He was the friend and disciple of Justin Martyr. Mr. Burkitt's (*Guardian*) date of 170-180 as the probable period of the introduction of the *Diatessaron* into the Syriac Church is about correct.



great importance to the inquiry on which we are now engaged. It is not, indeed, known, however probable, that Tatian composed his work in Syriac, but its widespread popularity amongst Syriac-speaking Christians is proof that a Syriac form of the *Diatessaron* existed. Unfortunately our knowledge of the book is mainly derived from other than Syrian sources.

The only complete form in which we have it is found in two Arabic manuscripts now at Rome, one in the Vatican (MS. xiv.) dating from the twelfth to the fourteenth century, and the other referred to the fourteenth, which was sent from Egypt in 1886, as a present to the Borgian Museum from its owner Halim Dos Gali.<sup>1</sup> A text has been edited from these two by Agostino Ciasca to commemorate the jubilee of the priesthood of Leo XIII., with a Latin translation, and an English translation has been made by Mr. G. Buchanan Gray, and is given in Mr. Hamlyn Hill's useful book.<sup>2</sup> It appears that, after the removal of the *Diatessaron* from use in the services of the Church, by direction of Rabbula, in order to give way to the *Mepharreshe* Gospels, after the drastic measures of Theodoret, and even after the forced supersession of Syriac for Arabic under Mohammedan domination, the *Diatessaron* still held a place as a literary document giving the connected account of our Lord's career.<sup>3</sup>

But we are enabled to get closer to the Syriac original in two other ways. A Latin translation of the commentary on the *Diatessaron* by Ephraim Syrus was found in the possession of the Mechitarist community established on the island of San Lazzaro in the lagoon of Venice, and was published in 1876 by Dr. Moesinger, Professor of Theology in the University of Salzburg. The passages commented on by St. Ephraim have been placed in connected order after the arrangement of the Arabic Version under the care of Professor Armitage Robinson, and can be found in one of Mr. Hamlyn Hill's Appendices. And in any notice of the *Diatessaron*, the very ingenious work of Dr. Zahn<sup>4</sup> cannot be omitted in which he extracted chiefly from the *Homilies of Aphraates*, but also from the *Discourses* of Jacobus Nisibenus, and from quotations in the works of St. Ephraim, passages

<sup>1</sup> Hamlyn Hill, *The Earliest Life of Christ, being the Diatessaron of Tatian*, 1894, Introduction, p. 2. Wright, *op. cit.* p. 10.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 41-263.

<sup>3</sup> See Hemphill's *The Diatessaron of Tatian*, 1888. Introduction, p. xxviii. *Four Gospels in Syriac*, Introduction, p. xxiii.

<sup>4</sup> *Forschungen*, i.; see also the article in *Church Quarterly Review*, January 1891.

which, from internal evidence, appeared to be cited from Tatian. The assemblage of passages from Ephraim's *Commentary* is fragmentary, but the collection made by Zahn, from the nature of the case, is unavoidably much more so.

Light is also shed upon the subject by the *Codex Fuldensis*, which was constructed upon the lines of the *Diatessaron* under the direction of Victor, Bishop of Capua, but with a Vulgate text.<sup>1</sup>

Such, then, is the present *apparatus criticus* as regards the actual text; but unfortunately the verdicts of the several documents do not agree. The Arabic text, if we may trust Mr. Hamlyn Hill's letters,<sup>2</sup> with allowance for the fact that the Curetonian includes only 1,848 verses of the Gospels out of the 3,780,<sup>3</sup> sides with the Peshitto as against the Curetonian in a full ratio of 3:2; whereas the Ephraim fragments agree with C as against P, according to Professor Hemphill, in the proportion of 26:7.<sup>4</sup> The verdict of the passages from Aphraates is said to lie on the same side. Whether these figures are correct or not, it may be held that the balance of evidence sinks against P. In fact, it appears that after, as Dr. Hort admits, the traditional text of the New Testament settled down from the time of St. Chrysostom onwards, the *Diatessaron* must have met with recension. We should infer that in its original form it was a third variant from the Peshitto in company with the Curetonian and the Lewis *Codex*.

But in one point it stands in remarkable contrast with the last of the three. We have already (p. 152) shown that the *Codex Ludovicianus* is marked with Cerinthian heresy:<sup>5</sup> the birth of our Lord is described as having come from Joseph instead of from the Holy Ghost. Except in a Gnostically spiritual sense, He is represented as having been Joseph's son. On the contrary, if we may believe Theodoret, bishop of Cirrhus, Tatian, in consonance with his Encratite opinions,

<sup>1</sup> Rev. H. J. White in Miller's edition of Scrivener's *Plain Introduction*, ii. 75; and for the entire subject see Rendel Harris, *Diatessaron of Tatian, passim*, Hamlyn Hill, *Introduction*, pp. 1-20, W. Elliott, *Tatian's Dia Tessaron and the Modern Critics*, Plymouth, pp. 86-113, Hemphill, *Introduction*, vii-xxi.

<sup>2</sup> *The Earliest Life*, pp. 292-317.

<sup>3</sup> Scrivener, 4th ed. ii. 14.

<sup>4</sup> It does not, however, seem certain that Hemphill's list, pp. 74-77, is exhaustive.

<sup>5</sup> 'We are entitled to say of the leading changes of text which appear in our copy that "an enemy hath done this," and to apply the adjective Cerinthian to the readings' (Rendel Harris, *ibid.* p. 673; see also *Church Times*, January 11, 1895).

' cut  
that  
flesh  
and  
doct  
sweet  
early  
alrea  
docu  
the t  
and

V  
foun  
Pesh  
gelia  
class  
more  
inter  
Sinai  
separ  
result  
used  
tion t  
used  
Gosp  
the n  
comp  
and S  
which

<sup>1</sup> C  
Hamly  
<sup>2</sup> T  
yvwaki  
(Guar  
spoken  
her hus  
and E  
negativ  
<sup>3</sup> A  
Syrian  
<sup>4</sup> M  
allowed  
Hebrew  
Thesau  
<sup>5</sup> N  
Hunt.  
<sup>6</sup> T  
coll. 33  
VOL

'cut out the genealogies and whatever other passages show that the Lord was born of the seed of David according to the flesh.<sup>1</sup> In fact, one deviated from the true text on one side, and the other in the opposite direction.<sup>2</sup> Thus, religious doctrine definitely influenced the text, and Dr. Hort's sweeping denial of the occurrence of such a phenomenon in early manuscripts is proved to be unsound, as has been already shown. And a proof is also supplied that these two documents could not have been links in the succession of the true texts of the Gospels; else, how are the introduction and subsequent elision of such alien elements to be explained?

We have seen that the title ܡܦܗܪܪܝܫܐ (*Mepharresha*) is found in connexion with the only two extant codices of extra-Peshitto text. It is not found as a title of Peshitto Evangelia,<sup>3</sup> and its absence is another distinction between the two classes. The usage of the term demands careful notice, the more so as an inference has been drawn through a particular interpretation of the meaning of it in the Curetonian and Sinaitic MSS. It is a passive participle, from a root 'to separate,' which is of very common occurrence,<sup>4</sup> with the result that the participial adjective is found to have been used in widely different applications. Confining our attention to its employment as a title, we find that it is sometimes used of the Peshitto Psalter,<sup>5</sup> though not of the Peshitto Gospels. It is used of an Evangelium,<sup>6</sup> which partakes of the nature of a harmony of the narratives, and is applied to complete and continuously written copies, like the Curetonian and Sinaitic. Cureton considered that ܡܦܗܪܪܝܫܐ (*Mepharresha*), which he thought was only predicated of *St. Matthew* in his

<sup>1</sup> *On Heresies*, cap. i. 20. The entire passage (translated) is given in Hamlyn Hill, p. 324, and in Elliott, p. 44.

<sup>2</sup> Thus of τῇ μεμνηστευμένη γυναικί (*St. Luke* ii. 5) Tatian leaves out γυναικί and the Sinaitic rejects μεμνηστευμένη. But why does Mr. Burkitt (*Guardian*, *l.c.*) say that 'in the *Diatessaron* Joseph and Mary are never spoken of as husband and wife'? In the Arabic (c. 2) we read, 'Joseph her husband,' and 'took unto him his wife.' The evidence of Aphraates and Ephraim does not permit the predication of any such universal negative.

<sup>3</sup> At least we find no instances in the British Museum Catalogue of Syriac MSS.

<sup>4</sup> Mrs. Lewis (*Translation*, Introduction, p. xxii) says:—'It is generally allowed that the word *parash* sometimes means "to transcribe" in Hebrew.' This remarkable statement is confirmed neither by Gesenius's *Thesaurus* nor Buxtorf's *Lexicon*.

<sup>5</sup> Nos. clxviii, clxix, clxx, in the *British Museum Catalogue*, also *Hunt*, 109 in the Bodleian Library.

<sup>6</sup> The usage is copiously illustrated in *Thes. Syr.* (Payne Smith), coll. 3303-4.

manuscript, indicated a *distinction* in the origin of the translation of that Evangelist.<sup>1</sup> Bernstein said that it referred to the *division* of the text into paragraphs for the purpose of public reading in the Church Services.<sup>2</sup> Gildemeister, assuming, with Cureton, that the adjective belonged to *St. Matthew*, took it as a title of the writer, 'Matthew the chosen.' The word has also been translated 'explained,' and it has been pointed out that the text of the Curetonian shows traces of attempts to explain the language of the Peshitto. Wright, although he translates *Evangelion da-Mēpharrēshē* (ܡܦܗܪܪܝܫܬܐ) 'the Separate Gospels,'<sup>3</sup> yet in the case of the Psalter says, 'the word seems here really to mean "of the interpreters" or "translators."' We have seen that the Sinaitic, no less than the Curetonian, abounds in readings which are of the nature of exegeses, or are amplifications of the Peshitto. In view of the ambiguity which attends the use of the term, the inquirer will hesitate to assume that the ܡܦܗܪܪܝܫܬܐ (*Mepharreshe*) Gospels, as we now have them, are so called, as having been 'separated' from a Harmony. The term, of course, denotes as much, in the order of Rabbula, to which we have already referred, but there is no proof that the copies he prescribed were *Curetonian-Sinaitic*. When we consider the familiarity with *Diatessaron* language<sup>5</sup> which the wide circulation of that work would produce, and the prevalence of corruptions in the Greek copies of the time, we recognise causes sufficient to account for the appearance in certain localities of texts such as are now preserved in the manuscripts discovered by Cureton and by Mrs. Lewis.

To conclude. The Syriac New Testament has come down to our times in two forms. (i) There are manuscripts of a text which was revised and adapted to Greek exemplars by Thomas of Harkel, in A.D. 616. This was based on the older revision by Philoxenus in 508, the manuscripts of which have been almost superseded by those of the Harkleian revision. Early in the fourth century Rab-

<sup>1</sup> Preface, p. vi.

<sup>2</sup> For this and the next two see *Journal of Sacred Literature*, viii. (1858), pp. 140f, 216f; x. 154, 377.

<sup>3</sup> *Syriac Literature*, quoted in *Four Gospels in Syriac*, Introduction, pp. xxiii-iv.

<sup>4</sup> *Catalogue Syr. MSS.* in the British Museum, i. 116 n.

<sup>5</sup> So Mr. Burkitt (*Guardian*, p. 707), describes the 'Separate Gospels' as 'written by scribes who very probably were accustomed to hear a Gospel Harmony read in the services of the Church.' Only Mr. Burkitt and his colleagues do not recognize the existence of the Peshitto at that date.

bula,  
some  
What  
the S  
thus t  
resulte  
The r  
are no  
cessor:  
recens  
little o  
Syriac  
(ii)  
of the  
the rev  
Syriac,  
Syrian  
text ca  
there i  
literary  
century  
extra-P  
manusc  
It  
New T  
tury.  
Peshitto  
the fart  
the best  
text wh  
Church,  
than an  
text is  
in the V  
not a fa  
corrupti  
days,  
by lines  
tonian fr  
1 Wright  
2 The P  
Peshitto r  
4th ed. vol  
3 As ap  
century aft  
pp. 323-4.

bula,<sup>1</sup> the friend of Cyril of Alexandria, occupied himself in some critical labours on the text of the New Testament. What precisely he did is not known. Probably he revised the Syriac in accordance with Alexandrian MSS. and was thus the precursor of Thomas and Philoxenus. Their labours resulted in the Harkleian-Philoxenian or Syriac Vulgate. The records of these revisions also suggest that when others are not recorded they were not made. Rabbula and his successors imitated the work of Jerome. The theory of an earlier recension requires us to suppose that the Syrians, who showed little originality in literature, set Jerome the example. This Syriac Vulgate is one form of text.

(ii) There are also extant a large number of manuscripts<sup>2</sup> of the other form of text, the Peshitto version, which preceded the revised Harkleian-Philoxenian text. This is the Old Syriac, and has never been superseded amongst the Eastern Syrians, nor wholly supplanted amongst the Westerns. Its text can be traced back to the days of Mar Ephraim, and there is absolutely no hint, much less record, in Syrian literary history, that it was revised in the third or fourth century; nor is there any proof that it was derived from the extra-Peshitto text which has been found in two fifth-century manuscripts.

It is admitted by all that a Syriac Version of the New Testament has existed from (perhaps) the second century. The place of this version has been taken by the Peshitto from the earliest times. Its text stretches back into the farthest regions of Syriac literature. It is a witness to the best form of the Greek text of the New Testament, that text which has been preserved in all parts of the Christian Church, and is more attested by the earliest Greek Fathers than any other. On the other hand, the Curetonian-Sinaitic text is a witness to the corrupt form of text which prevailed in the West and in Syria, amongst those to whom Greek was not a familiar language. It may be an ancient witness. The corruption of the Greek Testament dates back to very early days,<sup>3</sup> and almost from the first the pure line was accompanied by lines of depraved tradition. Manuscripts like the Curetonian fragments and the Sinaitic palimpsest are valuable for

<sup>1</sup> Wright, *op. cit.* p. 11.

<sup>2</sup> The number of ancient codices is so great that, in this respect, the Peshitto rivals even the Greek Testament. See Scrivener's *Introduction*, 4th ed. vol. ii. pp. 12, 13.

<sup>3</sup> As appears from the statements of Caius of Rome, only about a century after the close of the N.T. Canon, quoted in *Revision Revised*, pp. 323-4. See also Scrivener, vol. ii. chap. ix. §§ 2-5.

the help they supply in tracing the causes of textual corruptions, and the history of the transmission of the text through successive ages. But we must not look to them in their connexion with the text of codex B<sup>1</sup> (or to any other limited class of documents) for the true text of the New Testament. That text is to be found in the contents of the vast number of codices which are the representatives of various streams of tradition, and is supported by collateral evidence of Versions and Fathers, of which some of the best and clearest is that which is afforded by the testimony of the ancient Syriac Peshitto Version.

#### ART. VI.—THE TROPER AND THE GRADUAL.

1. *The Winchester Troper, from Manuscripts of the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries, with other Documents.* Edited by WALTER HOWARD FRERE, M.A., of the Community of the Resurrection, Radley. (London: for the 'Henry Bradshaw Liturgical Text Society,' 1894.)
2. *Graduale Sarisburiense.* Reproduced in facsimile from a manuscript of the thirteenth century, for the Plainsong and Mediæval Music Society, by W. H. FRERE. Two Parts, folio. (London, 1892-4.)
3. *Graduale ad veram et integram preclare ecclesie Sarum consuetudinem.* Folio. (Paris: N. Prevost, 1527-32.)
4. *Missale Sarum.* Paris, Regnault, 4to, 1527. *The same,* Burntisland, ed. Dickinson, 1861-83.
5. *Music Loan Exhibition,* 1885. Catalogue of Manuscripts, &c. By W. J. H. WEALE. (London, 1886.)
6. *Bibliotheca Musico-Liturgica.* List of Manuscripts drawn up by W. H. FRERE. For the Plainsong Society. Fascic. i. (London, 1894.)

THOSE who had the good fortune to visit the Historical Music Loan Exhibition in the gallery at the Albert Hall in the summer or autumn of 1885 may remember, among the greatest treasures there exhibited, seven manuscripts from the Library of St. Gall, the home of Notker Balbulus, the father of the German school of Sequences. These were one Gradual of the ninth and two of the eleventh century, an early tenth century Troper, a tenth century Troper, Gradual, and Sequences in one, with the letter of Notker to the Bishop of

<sup>1</sup> On the real character of this ancient, but often solitary witness, see Miller's *Textual Guide*, pp. 54-9.

Ver  
thir  
add  
Mass  
singi  
T  
mann

each  
pair  
wrote  
book  
And  
an un  
for a  
impre

So  
books  
is, or  
Paris,  
Trope  
conter  
mistak  
called  
comm  
althou  
mens

It  
plexity  
Sarum  
had ce

<sup>1</sup> Sp  
attached  
Julian's  
(cir. 900  
MS. 339  
1889.

<sup>2</sup> Acc  
troparia  
they tur  
Ch. pp. 8  
Western  
Kyrie el  
quod est  
prolog.

<sup>3</sup> The  
book to  
(F. E. W



Vercelli, and an Antiphonarium written at the close of the thirteenth century, with an office and sequence for St. Francis added in 1323, besides a sixteenth century choir-book of Masses with sequences, written at a time when four-part singing had been introduced.

The earliest St. Gall Gradual, set in such a striking manner

‘twixt board and board of oaken tree’

each an inch and a half thick, and one of them containing a pair of ivory plaques, at least four centuries old when Notker wrote, and three hundred years older than the ancient music book which they now contain, will not easily be forgotten. And the Tropers, with their lines of music in neumes which an uninformed spectator might mistake for old shorthand or for a representation of some strange telegraphic code, have impressed themselves upon our memories.<sup>1</sup>

So many of our readers as chanced to see certain of these books from St. Gall, or who may remember a Troper which is, or was, displayed in a show case in the great library at Paris, will have at least some general notion of what a Troper looks like, even if they feel that their ideas of its contents are somewhat indefinite, and they will not make the mistake of confounding it with the Greek hymns and hymnals called *troparia*, with which it has no connexion beyond a common derivation from the Greek word for ‘turning,’ although the Western Tropers contained some curious specimens of Greek and had something to do with singing.<sup>2</sup>

It is only natural, and indeed inevitable, that some perplexity about these volumes should prevail. Even when Sarum Use was almost unknown, or hardly formed, Tropers had ceased to have a living existence.<sup>3</sup> Specimens were to

<sup>1</sup> Specimens of neumes and Latin musical notation will be found attached to the late Recorder of Sarum’s (J. D. Chambers) article in Julian’s *Dictionary of Hymnology*, pp. 654-5. The St. Gall MS. 359 (cir. 900) has been edited (facsimile) at Paris (Lambillotte, 1851). And MS. 339 (late tenth century) in *Paléographie Musicale*, i., Solesmes, 1889.

<sup>2</sup> According to Arcadius, the *εἶπος* takes its name from *drawing* the *troparia*, or short hymns, after it. The *τροπάρια* are so called because they *turn towards* their model hymn, the *hirmos*. See Neale, *Eastern Ch.* pp. 830-33, *nn.* According to Sicardus of Cremona (cir. 1200) the Western ‘*Tropalis* vel *Troparius* est liber in quo *tropi*, id est hymni [et *Kyrie eleison*] cum prosis et sequentiæ continentur; et dicitur a *τροπός*, quod est *conuersio*; quia conuertitur ad introitum,’ *Mitrale*, lib. 5, prolog.

<sup>3</sup> The name ‘*troparium*’ continued for some time in use, but the book to which it was applied was merely a collection of Sequences. (F. E. Warren in Julian’s *Dict. Hymnol.* p. 1186 a.)

be found in the Churches here and there, but they were the books cast off by a generation that had passed away. The tropes were discredited by those in authority (and *who* shall altogether blame those powers that *were?*), and by the thirteenth century those elements of the old Tropers which had life remaining in them, had transfused themselves into more modern service-books. So thorough had been the clearance that it is only astonishing to us that so many as sixty Tropers are reported to have been seen in Christendom within the observation of modern students of music or liturgiology.

Those which Mr. Frere has introduced to our notice in the volume which he has recently edited for the 'Henry Bradshaw Society,' are as follows: two Winchester Tropers, the earliest of them being contemporary with St. Dunstan and St. Ethelwold; the Canterbury Troper in the Cottonian collection; and the Dublin Troper (now at Cambridge) in the same volume with Dr. Todd's famous manuscript of the Sarum Custom Book, besides twelfth or thirteenth century Graduals of Worcester and St. Albans containing tropes, and some Continental specimens introduced to give the reader some notion of the French and German schools of music books, and particularly the former, with which our Tropers had the closer affinity.

As the book has been edited for a society whose business is with liturgical texts, the 'Winchester Troper' and the 'other documents' appear shorn of their musical accompaniment, if we may for a moment adopt this phrase. It is historically most inappropriate, since, as will presently be seen, the text was in this case the accompaniment to the music. However, by dint of producing admirable collotypes and a lucid Introduction, Mr. Frere has provided a volume which has its attractions for those who are interested in the history and archæology of music as well as for the student of service-books, whose principal care is for the rites or words recited. The collotype plates consist of thirty-one leaves and three smaller pieces attached, all of them containing musical notation as well as words. Three leaves (slightly reduced) containing Sequences are derived from *E*, the (Ethelred) Winchester Troper, which, as we understand, was written in the year 979.<sup>1</sup> Twenty-three plates (the size of their originals) represent various sections of the other (eleventh century) Winchester

<sup>1</sup> Ethelred succeeded King Edward the Martyr († March 18) 979. Dedication of Winchester changed by addition of St. Swithun's name, October 20, 980.

book, and four pages considerably reduced, but not so as to be illegible, are gathered from a fourteenth century Processional now in Archbishop Marsh's library, but formerly belonging to St. John the Evangelist's, Dublin. Facing the three earliest specimens (tenth century) and three of the later Winchester tropes for *Eduxit Dominum*, *Pascha nostrum*, *Cithara*, *Benedicta*, and *Fulgens preclara*, are six excellent specimens of modern (old-style) music-printing in black and red, executed at St. Mary's, Wantage, which is as clear as anything which we have seen from Desclée's famous warehouse in recent years, and has not the heaviness of some of the sixteenth century music.

But we must attempt to give some notion of the characteristics of a Troper to those who have never seen one of these rare books, or who have not had the opportunity of investigating their contents. We suppose that if Henry Bradshaw had been asked where any vestige of the Troper might be found at the present day, he would have replied, 'In your Book of Common Prayer'—only of course you go to church at St. Præposterus's, where they shorten the service by leaving out the Ten Commandments, and so produce a liturgy without any vestige of the Kyrie.' It may certainly be said that if only the revisers in 1552 had written '*Christ*, have mercy upon us, and incline our hearts to keep this law' after the fourth, fifth, and sixth commandments, they would have produced in their treatment of the decalogue a '*Kyrie cum farsura*' on the same lines as those which once were in the Troper, and were afterwards preserved on the last pages of the Gradual and the Missal. For instance, we have on the last leaf but one of a small quarto Sarum Missal, printed by F. Regnault at Paris, July 27, 1527, an appendix, '*de cantu Kyrie eleyson*,' and on the last page of all a '*Prosa*' or, as we should commonly say, a Sequence by Adam of St. Victor, laureate of the French school, for Easter Monday. Of those nine Kyries '*cum versibus*' found in the late Sarum book, five are in the tenth century Troper, and the others appear in one or more of Mr. Frere's 'other documents,' as may be seen in his index to the greater Tropes (to *Kyrie*, *Gloria*, *Sanctus*, and *Agnus*), a list which comprises about thirty-six Kyries, and a few duplicates with a varied opening. In like manner Proses and Sequences are proper material for the

We might add, 'in Hymns Ancient and Modern, Dr. Neale's *The strain upraise*, and less properly, "At the Cross" (the "*Stabat Mater*"); as well as "That day of wrath" in Scott's *Lay of the Last Minstrel*.' But none of these came direct.

Troper, although the Sequence at the end of the 1527 Missal, 'Zyma vetus,' does not chance to be old enough to have been included in the Tropers of the eleventh century.

'A *Troparium*,' said Mr. Bradshaw, 'is by rights the complement of the *Graduale*.'<sup>1</sup> The phrase 'by rights' is important, for the Troper and the Gradual each admitted things to which they had no claim, somewhat as a railway-guide will admit tables of steamers, or a prayer-book Articles of religion.

Mr. Bradshaw continued :

'The *Graduale* contains what may be called the Gregorian or Scriptural portion of the choral part of the *Missale* : the Introit and Psalm, Gradual and Respond, Offertory and Communion.'<sup>2</sup>

'The *Troparium* contains on the other hand the non-Gregorian or non-Scriptural additions, which having been mostly developed in the far West, and having been crushed out—at least the most extravagant elements of them—by, if not before, the thirteenth century, no separate *Troparia* seem ever to have been written after that date, the matter which was left being always contained in the *Graduale*.

'The Sequences (words or prose set to the prolonged notes of the repeated *Alleluia* before the Gospel) and a few of the farsings to the *Kyrie* and *Gloria in excelsis* still are to be found in the Sarum books as we have them.' [See for instance the *Gloria in excelsis* farsed ('*cum farsura*,' as it is styled in Caxton's pie) with *Spiritus et alme orphanorum paraclite* in the *Sarum Breviary*, ii. 483, or *Missal*, pp. 585-6.]

'But of the genuine *tropi* or farsings to the Introit, and the similar expansions of the *Sanctus* and *Agnus Dei*, &c., all trace seems to have been swept away by the thirteenth century.'<sup>3</sup>

A brief summary of the contents of the Mass will serve to show how largely tropes and their congeners entered into the liturgy at one period, and at the same time in what manner the Troper and the Gradual were mutually complementary. Leaving out of the question such parts as the *Confiteor* and private or semi-private devotions of the priest, and using *italics* to denote portions of the service which, like our Collect, Epistle, and Gospel, were *variable*, while we enclose in paren-

<sup>1</sup> *Breviarium ad usum Sarum*, ed. Cantab. 1886, fasc. iii. p. lxxxix (introductory). 'No one acquainted with the barbarous *Kyries* found in the English Missals can wonder at our reformers substituting something more practical while they grudged the destruction of the old familiar form.'

<sup>2</sup> In like manner in his introduction to *Grad. Sarisburiense*, pp. xi-xii, Mr. Frere enumerates 'Office, Gradual, Alleluia or Tract, Offertory and Communion,' as the original and practically unaltered Gregorian nucleus of each Mass.

<sup>3</sup> H. Bradshaw in Introduction to *Brev. Sarum*, iii. p. lxxxix.

theses ( ) those parts which were liable to omission at certain seasons or occasions, we may give the following order from a Missal of English use.

\*† *Officium*, i.e. the introit, an antiphon, with its *Psalmus*.

\*§ 'Kyrie eleison' cum *versibus*.

(\*§ 'Gloria in excelsis.'†)

*Oratio*, i.e. Collect or Orison.

(§ *Prophetia*, i.e. Old Testament lection.)

§ *Epistle*.

(\* *Gradale*, a Respond.)

(\* 'Alleluia' † *Verset*.)

+ [\* *Sequence*, or the

\* *Tract*, a Psalm sung 'in directum.']\*<sup>1</sup>

*Gospel*.

(\* 'Credo in unum.')†

\*† *Offertorium*, an antiphon, with \*† *Verses*.

'Suscipe' and other prayers. 'Munda me.'

'Orate fratres' and *Secreta*, a collect.

*Preface*: 'Vere dignum . . . Æterne Deus,' *variable clauses*.

\*§ 'Sanctus.'

'Te igitur.' 'Imprimis.' 'Memento.'

'Communicantes.' 'Hanc igitur.' 'Quam oblationem.'

'Qui pridie.' 'Unde et memores.' 'Supra quæ.'

'Supplices Te.' 'Memento etiam.' 'Nobis quoque.'

'Per Quem.' 'Per omnia.'

'Præceptis.' 'Pater noster.' 'Libera.' 'Da.' 'Per omnia.'

'Pax Do~~x~~mini.'

\*§ 'Agnus Dei.'

'Hæc sacrosancta.' 'Pax tibi.' Priest's communion.

'Quod ore sumpsimus.' 'Hæc nos.'

\*† *Communio*, an antiphon.<sup>2</sup>

*Postcommunio*, a collect.

\*§ 'Ite missa est.'

\*§ 'Benedicamus.') (alternatives).

'Requiescant.'

'Placeat tibi.'

In the foregoing list an obelus (†) marks the parts where *lesser tropes* are found. The sign § indicates those portions which were liable to be sung or recited *cum farsura*—that is,

<sup>1</sup> *In directum*, without repeat. *Grad. Sarisb.* p. xxxii.

<sup>2</sup> An *antiphona ad communicandum* (p. 19) finds a place in the Tropers in England as well as in France. It was used apparently on the three great festivals, when communicants were most numerous (p. xxvii). Mr. Frere tells us (*Grad. Sarisb.* p. xxxi) that the Communion Antiphon was attached to a psalm. The rubrics annexed to the Ordinary of the Mass in the Roman Missal are reticent about the '*Communio*' and '*Postcommunio*.' See its General Rubrics, xiii. 1, and 'Ritus Celebrandi,' xi. 1, for the rules concerning them.

with interpolations interrupting or glossing the portion of the liturgy—whereas the other tropes may be considered as musical rather than textual excrescences, coming as they do on the outskirts of the liturgical passage to which they were annexed.

Thus the portions marked † and those marked §, *taken together*, make up the proper text of the Troper music-book.

The asterisk marks those portions which we find in the *Sarum Graduale*. Where it occurs in close juxtaposition with one of the other signs, as \*† or \*§, it may be inferred that when Tropers were generally exterminated, about the end of the twelfth century, the Grayles gave shelter and protection to those ejected members which had in them some vitality. In some cases only the efflorescent melodies survived; in others (as the nine farsed *Kyries*) the non-Scriptural words continued to be sung on special occasions up to the sixteenth century. We mark the *Sequences* in a special way, because they are not originally a portion of the ordinary service, but are themselves a developed trope, growing out of the 'Alleluia.'<sup>1</sup> The 'Gloria in excelsis' has an obelus in addition to its other mark, because the Easter trope itself came in course of time, as Mr. Frere points out,<sup>2</sup> to exhibit the strange phenomenon of 'a trope troped,' or a *trope upon a trope*.

The *Sarum* customs were written down, and the cathedral church in Salisbury itself established, about the time when tropes had fallen out of favour. It is interesting to notice what provision for books was made when the new church was being designed.

So far as the high altar at Salisbury is concerned we unfortunately have no record of books provided, excepting texts of the Epistles and Gospels in 1222. The record of provision made for the projected minor altars is likewise fragmentary—that is to say, it breaks off abruptly; but a record for six of the altars is complete.<sup>3</sup> Each of these six altars had one Missal (St. Stephen's altar, south of the Lady Chapel, having also a second copy, and moreover a pair of copper candlesticks, when most of the other altars had none), and the Missals were the only books in the treasurer's charge for three of the altars (viz. St. Peter's, St. Stephen's, opposite it, and

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Frere is inclined to class the Alleluia, technically, as a Respond, which he defines as a duet between soloist and choir, as the Antiphon is a duet between choir and choir. *Grad. Sarisb.* p. xxxii.

<sup>2</sup> *Winchester Troper*, p. xv, cf. p. 55.

<sup>3</sup> Rock, *Ch. of our Fathers*, tom. iv. pp. 107–10, last pagination. See also p. 106.



St. Mary Magdalene's in the south-east transept). The other three had each one book of Epistles or Gospels; St. Nicholas, between the last-named altar and the vestry, having only two books, a Missal and one volume of Epistles and Gospels. The altar of St. Thomas the Martyr, near the old door at the end of the great north transept, had a grayle, or *graduale*, besides a Mass-book and a book of Epistles, two brass candlesticks, silk cushion, lectern, pair of tin cruets, &c. This was an important altar, at least in later times, for the weekly commemoration Mass of St. Thomas and the votive Mass of the Blessed Sacrament were said here, on Tuesday and Thursday respectively, in the latter half of the fifteenth century. At that time the ornaments were naturally more numerous, but among them were still two little brass candlesticks, (five) pewter cruets, &c., and the books there were a Missal and *Legenda*, both in good condition, some hand tablets (*tabulae manuales*) in triptych and diptych form, two psalters and a mattins-book or *Legenda*, chained, and two volumes containing the Life and Letters of St. Thomas chained together. The Gradual of the thirteenth century list perhaps had become obsolete, and in 1389 had not been replaced. There was also a little book with the Seven (penitential) Psalms and the Litany, chained.<sup>1</sup>

But returning to the early thirteenth century list, we find the remaining altar (of those six whose ornaments are still on record) to be the best furnished, as was fitting. For the altar of All Hallows, which was dedicated September 28, 1225, became at once the altar of the daily Mass of the Blessed Virgin, founded there by Bishop Poore, from which circumstance the alternative name of the 'Salve Chapel' or Lady Chapel was derived. Here, besides a pair of silver cruets, the gift of the succentor John (*i.e.* before 1213), a liturgical fan (*flabellum*), a cushion of silk and another, a lectern, two wooden forms, and various vestments and other furniture, there were the following books in 1222:

a Missal  
a Grayle  
a book of Gospels and Epistles, and three quires with 'Alleluya,' &c.

and in 1225 two silver candlesticks were added.<sup>2</sup> It is of the Grayle ('Gradale') and the three parchment music books that we have presently to speak.

The former, no doubt, was a book of some bulk, though

<sup>1</sup> *Sarum Muniments*; 'Dunham' Register, fo. 55 b.

<sup>2</sup> Rock, *u. s.*; and *Osmund Reg.* (ed. Jones), ii. 39, 139.

not so large, it may be, as the printed books which were its immediate successors.

Next to its sister, the Antiphoner, printed in 1519–20, and its cousin, the *Legenda*, printed in 1491 by Higman, and in 1518 (like the Antiphonale) by Hopyl for Byrckman, the *Graduale* is the rarest among the principal service-books of Sarum use. Unlike these, it has not hitherto been described in modern times, as Mr. Maskell contented himself with discarding on a manuscript copy, and Mr. Dickinson had not observed the difference between the various printed copies until it was too late to give an account of them in his edition of the Missal (p. xix).

As had been the case with the Antiphonarium and the *Legenda*, Paris was the place where the Sarum *Gradual* was printed, and in one instance Francis Byrckman was again the merchant who procured it for customers in England. It was printed three times at least, and always by Nicolas Prevost, in folio, for the music desk. The second edition, in 1528, was not a line for line reproduction, but we may almost call it a page for page reprint of the former edition of the preceding year. In 1532 Prevost brought out a new edition (the third now known to us), and the account which he gives, 'ut res ipsa indicat,' is more trustworthy than the self-praisings of some other sixteenth-century printers upon their titles and their colophons. The former editions consisted alike of just 300 folios.<sup>1</sup> The musical type was of a fair size, but not particularly elegantly or clearly cut. In 1532 the printer tells us that the music in the new edition is executed in bolder fount, so as to be legible at a greater distance by the rulers and the singers—'Crassioribus quam antea notis (vt longius videri ac percipi possint).'<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The contents of the editions of 1527 and 1528 alike are *Kalendar* and *Bened. aquæ* sig.  $\alpha^8$ ; *Temporale* a—x<sup>8</sup>, y<sup>10</sup> = 178 leaves, the last of them being blank; *Sanctorale* A—E<sup>8</sup>, F<sup>12</sup> (Gothic) = 52 leaves not foliated; and *Commune Sanctorum* &c., A—G<sup>8</sup>, H<sup>12</sup> (Lombardic) = 62 leaves; total, 300. The parts corresponding in the third edition, 1532, are 8; 196; 58; 72 = 334. Consequently 1532 runs to 32 more leaves than its predecessors.

<sup>2</sup> A fair notion of the *style* of the music of this folio may be gathered from the somewhat smaller, 8vo, music-fount facing facsimiles 1—5 and 22 at the end of Mr. Frere's *Troper*, and printed, as we have mentioned already, under the auspices of the Mother and Community of St. Mary's, Wantage. The title-page of 1527 is distinguished by the 'arms' or emblem of the Trinity ('pater non est filius . . . est Deus,' &c.) enclosed (at the top) by the prayer 'Sancta Trinitas vnus deus miserere nobis, and (at the bottom) the motto, found often likewise in Byrckman's books, 'Fortuna opes auferre non animum potest.' Down the sides are small woodcuts of St. Hierome, St. Thomas of Canterbury, St. Augustine

The title-page of the third edition is like the second in having the motto 'Fortuna' at top and bottom, but between them is the title (in which the italics denote letters in red)

¶ *Graduale ad vsū ecclesie Sarisburiensis* / ad verorū exemplariū fidē diligētissime recognitū : et a mēdis omnibus tam in cantu q̄ in litera expurgatū. Crassiorib' q̄ antea notis (vt lōgius videri ac pcipi possint) solertissime Parisijs excusū  
M.D. xxxij.

In the centre a block 4 in. × 2½ in. with the 'intersignum elephantis' bearing on his castle the initials and streaming F of 'Francoys Regnavlt.' Below which,

¶ *Venundantur Londonij apud Robertum Redman. Et Parisijs apud Franciscum Regnault.*

The last page but one of this latest edition gives the date 'Sexto Calendas Julias' 1532, but it has also, like the others, a distinctive final page. The three editions here, as on their titles, show Prevost's fertility of design.<sup>1</sup> In the third edition

(dexter), and St. Ambrose, Ven. Bede, and St. Gregory (on the sinister side). At the top of all is the title

¶ *Graduale secundū morem & cōsuetudinem preclare ecclesie Sarum politissimis formulis* (vt res ipsa tēdicat) in alma *Parisiorū Academia* impressum.

The second edition has at the top (under 'Fortuna opes,' &c., on a flying ribbon)

¶ *Graduale ad verā et integrā preclare ecclesie Sarū consuetudinē* / nuper *Parisijs excussum*.

Then comes the three-tier picture of the Adoration of the Magi, St. Ursula and her Company, and the Martyrdom of the Maccabees, with other surroundings, as described in the account of other Sarum folio books in the Introduction to the Sarum Breviary, iii., pp. liii, lxii. Below this are the words in red,

*Venundatur Londonij a Francisco Byrckman : apud cimiterium diui Pauli.* M.d. xxvij.

with the same motto and a shield left vacant for an owner's arms.

<sup>1</sup> In 1527 he has on his last page, between two trees, and supported by two eagles betwixt beak and claw, two roundels (the upper one crowned) containing a statement that 'Graduale ad consuetudinem insignis ecclesie Sarum.' &c. &c. was printed 'In alma Parisiorum Academia. Anno domini virtutum/ conditorisque mundi. Millesimo quingentesimo vigesimo septimo Calendas Januarias.' The preceding page, which mentions W. de Worde and others, appears to have been in the

the letterpress which appeared in the middle of the last page of the intermediate edition, is in 1532 *mutatis mutandis* cast into the effective form of a *chalice*, covered apparently by paten and host—a design appropriate to the class to whom it is addressed. A similar shape, but not so cleverly executed, may be seen in the colophon of a quarto ‘Pupilla Oculi,’ printed in 1522 (June 26) by J. Petit at Paris, of which a copy was in the possession of the late Canon William Cooke, whose loss is deeply felt by not a few of our readers.

*From the last page of the Sarum Gradual, 1532.*

¶ Habetis viri celeberrimi /  
 insignis ecclesie anglicane sacerdotes : hoc vestrū  
*Graduale* nuper Parisijs diligenti Frā-  
 cisci Regnault bibliopole vestri  
 solertia efformatum : qui  
 et de vobis bene  
 mereri non  
 destitit  
 vnq̃  
 Cum profecto is sit  
 qui non modo hoc ipsum  
*Graduale* integri-  
 tati  
 restituere  
*curauerit* : verū-  
 etiam vt nitidis chara-  
 cteribus cuderetur : non quē-  
 uis impressorem / sed Nicholaum Pre-  
 uost calcographum imprimis industrium delegerit.  
 ¶ Fortuna opes auferre : non animum potest.

Below is a device of François Regnault’s Elephant and Castle, rather smaller than that upon his title-page.

press ten days earlier (xvij ‘Calendas Januarias’). The edition of the following year had also two roundels, but with letterpress in red and black between them ; the top one represents a hen and chickens encircled by the text, in uncials which have something of an Italian appearance, ‘✱ Quoties volui congregare filios tuos . quemadmodum gallina congregat pullos suos .’ and the lower one bears the monogram A. W. surmounted by an inverted figure 4, crosslet, and the name Fr. Bir[ckman], surrounded by the motto ‘✱. Fortuna cum blanditur . tunc vel maxime metuenda est.’ The preceding page gives the date ‘Sexto Calendas Julias’ 1528.

L  
 porti  
 Kale  
 Thes  
 (a  
 sons  
 (d  
 days  
 only  
 mon  
 (a  
 had r  
 holde  
 out i  
 one (c  
 for a  
 useful  
 Masse  
 of all,  
 (d  
 Kyrie  
 Ite m  
 Sp  
 conta  
 Mass

1 T  
 Gradua

D
(title 17 col. K
"
(title 16 col. 6 K
"
"
"
(6 Ka
"

Mr.  
 to the E

Like the Missal, the Gradual consists of four principal portions to which (in the printed books, at all events<sup>1</sup>) a Kalendar, with form for blessing holy water, is prefixed. These parts are:

(a) The *Temporale*, giving the proper service of the seasons from Advent to after Trinity.

(b) The *Sanctorale*, giving the like service proper for holy-days from St. Andrew's Eve onward for the year, exclusive only of the Saints' days near Christmas, which, as in our Common Prayer Book, are attached to the 'Temporale.'

(c) The *Commune Sanctorum*, to serve for those Saints who had not an entire 'proper' service of their own, but were beholden to some common form: i.e., as Mr. Frere has pointed out in his *Graduale* (p. xxi), *originally* the service proper to *one* (old established) Saint which, becoming in time adapted for a class, presently lost its individuality through its wider usefulness. To the 'Common' services are attached votive Masses for week days and other particular occasions, and, last of all,

(d) for the *Ordinarium Missæ*, music belonging to the *Kyrie, Gloria in excelsis, Sanctus, Agnus, Benedicamus*, and *Ite missa est*.

Speaking of the 'Gradual' in general, we may say that it contains, with the musical notes attached, those parts of the Mass which we have marked with an asterisk in our list given

<sup>1</sup> The following is a list of the editions and surviving copies of the Gradual.

GRADUALE SARUM.

Date.	Size.	Leaves.	Place.	Printer.	Merchants.	Owners.
1527 (title 17 Kal. Jan. col. Kal. Jan.)	Folio.	300	Paris.	Nic. Prevost.	W. de Worde, Jo. Renis, Lud. Suethon.	Bodleian, Gough 35.
" "	"	"	"	" "	" "	Christ Church, H. 3. 1. 7.
1528 (title 16 Kal. Jul. col. 6 Kal. Jul.)	Folio.	300	Paris.	Nic. Prevost.	F. Byrckman of Köln; sold by him in St. Paul's Ch. Yd., London.	Univ. Library, Camb., E. 1. 18.
" "	"	"	"	" "	" "	" G. 1. 6.
" "	"	"	"	" "	" "	Dean and Ch. Salisbury.
" "	"	"	"	" "	" "	Sir W. Turner's Hospital, Kirk- leatham, Red- car.
1532 (6 Kal. Jul.)	Folio.	334	Paris.	Nic. Prevost.	F. Regnault; sold by him in Paris, and by Ro. Red- man in London.	British Museum, case 35, l. 5.
" "	"	"	"	" "	" "	Bodleian, Gough, 34.

Mr. Dickinson in 1850 mentioned a copy of the last edition belonging to the Earl of Shrewsbury.

above, and has become, especially in its appendix, or part (*d*), and in its store of Sequences, the 'residuary legatee' of the extinct Troper of centuries ix.-xii.

The rubrics of the Gradual are for the most part derived from the Missale, or from some common sources such as the Sarum Custom-Book and 'Directorium Missae.' Mr. F. H. Dickinson has pointed out, in notes to the Burntisland edition of the Sarum Missal, several places in which the Grayle is independent, and the facsimiles produced for the 'Plainsong and Mediæval Music Society' contain some other instances: *e.g.* the rubric for the Christmas Mass at Dawn, where the duties of the acolytes are detailed (Plate E.). The Graduale (under whatever title)<sup>1</sup> being the altar-antiphoner provided to contain the music of Introits, Psalms, *Graduals* (from which it took its name), and Responds, Offertory Anthems, and Communions—in other words, the 'Gregorian or Scriptural portion of the choral part of the Missale'—then, when a collection of non-Scriptural additions had come into being, other music-books were provided for the latter non-Gregorian additions or insertions, and these books for liturgical interpolations were known as Tropers.

It was, we presume, as a makeshift for the discarded Tropers, that the three little copy-books or 'quarternions' of 'Alleluyas, &c.' were, as we have seen, provided for the projected 'Salve' or Lady Chapel, with its altar of the Ever Blessed Trinity and All Hallows, early in the thirteenth century.

On a great festival the concluding vowel of 'Alleluia' before the Gospel for the day will run on for forty or fifty notes. In old times it might number hundreds. There may be truth in the saying of certain ritualists, that this was done with a purpose—namely, to occupy the time while between Epistle and Gospel the deacon's procession was meeting the sub-deacon's recession to or from the 'pulpit' or ambon by the rood at the entrance of the choir, somewhat as the organist in our churches now will play the reader to the lectern after Magnificat or Nunc Dimittis. We do not, however,

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Frere says (*Grad. Sarisb.* p. xxxi): The Sarum Gradual is 'in its contents marvellously the same as the first Antiphonale which came with St. Gregory's mission to England; and St. Augustine, could he have come to life in the sixteenth century, and been given the latest Sarum Gradual from the Paris press, would probably have had some difficulty in finding his place, and greater difficulty in following the Guidonian notation, but he would have known almost every piece in the book.' As early Graduals, we may mention those of the Treasury of Monza, early eighth century (Thomasii, *Op.* v. 257-66), and St. Albans, Benedictine, twelfth century (*Brit. Mus. Reg.* 2 B. iv.)



think that this utilitarian consideration was half so powerful a factor in the case as the natural propensity of the singer's voice to outrun the words allotted to him. It is not only 'your clowns' in Hamlet, who are apt to recite 'more than is set down for them'; but Ophelia, when her poor heart is set on singing, is true to nature when she will not stop with the poet's verses—'You must sing *Down a-down-a*, an you call him *a-down-a*,' and she exclaims, in genuine admiration of the refrain, 'O how the *wheel* becomes it!' The simple ballad is always apt to run, in singing, to a 'fal-a-la-la' or 'tra-la-la-la-la' prolongation of its lines or stanzas. In the Church service these prolongations by the voice—*jubila* or *jubili*, as they were called—continuing long after the prescribed words had been expended by the singers, were introduced at every conceivable point from Introit to 'Ite missa est'; every portion of the musical service, variable or invariable, all came alike to the chorister of eight or nine centuries ago; for, like Hudibras,

'he could not ope

His mouth, but out there came a Trope.'

The Gradual or 'Responsorium' alone seems to have been exempt, but they made up by taking the fullest liberty with the Alleluia. But inasmuch as in the Church things must be done 'decently and in order,' and the voices of the singers, no less than 'the spirits of the prophets,' must be subject to their power, the notes of the *jubila* were very precisely defined, even where the ruler of the choir might occasionally have some discretion in choosing this one or that for a specific service ('*pro dispositione cantoris*,' as the Graduale rubric said).

It probably occurred to several choir-men independently to make a *memoria technica* for these 'crafty notys,' i.e. to fit metrical words to the protracted melodies. Such adapted 'prose,' sung at first under their breath by the inventors and their intimate friends, were sure, sooner or later, to be overheard. Choir-masters and precentors first inquired into them, then approved and definitely adopted them. The story has been often told how the French monk, escaping when the Abbey of Jumièges was sacked by the Normans in 851, came into Switzerland after wanderings almost as long as those of Ulysses; and how Notker Balbulus, after examining the foreigner's Antiphoner, was stimulated to compose his famous Sequences. In two or three of his facsimiles Mr. Frere shows us how in the Westminster Tropers *prosulae* were written to

<sup>1</sup> 1 Cor. xiv. 15, 32, 40.

follow a Sequence: *e.g.* the 'Alleluya,' with its six-fold *Prosula* 'Rex in æternum suscipe [*al.* 'tribue'] benignus præconia nostra . . . Victor ubique morte superata atque triumphata . . . ' &c., &c. These six pieces appear to have been interpolated in the body of the Alleluya, apart from the regular Sequence 'Fulgens præclara rutilat per orbem' which has sixteen strophes, the author whereof is (says Dr. Julian) unknown.

Certain characteristics must have been obvious to those who are already acquainted with the Sequences in the mediæval service-books of the great English Uses which have been made accessible by Mr. Dickinson and Dr. Henderson, and in the collections of Daniel, Weale, and others. As to form, some are in stanzas like hymns: such are the later compositions from the French (and English) school—

'Verbum bonum et suäue  
Pandit intus in conclaue,  
Et ex 'Eua' format 'Aue,'  
Euæ verso nomine.'

(from 'Missus Gabriel' ascribed to a Cluniac prior of Montacute in Somersetshire), 'Salve mater Salvatoris,' and indeed the poems of Adam St. Victor generally. A very few Sequences are in hexameter lines:

'Alma chorus Domini nunc pangat nomina summi.'

'Alma Dei genitrix æterni luminis aula.'

See Henderson's *York Missal*, i. 154, ii. 208.

Others again, and these are of the earlier or German type, are *sermoni propiora*, or run in strophes as perplexing to the uninitiated as the chorus of a Greek play is to the ordinary schoolboy. In fact they are, as their name indicates, words or *prose* set to wild melodies. In another respect also the Sequences of the last-mentioned class betray their specific origin as being connected with the prolongation of the Allelu-y-a-a-a: they are full of vowel sounds, and run especially upon the letter A. For example, in a common Sequence for an Apostle, 'Alleluya nunc decantet,' we find such lines as

'O quanta quam præclara quam iocunda celebrantur hac mensa  
conuiuia;  
Iam palma, iam corona, iam promissa olim mensa illis est apposita,'  
&c.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> For an instance of the A termination in the Winchester Troper see the *Prosa ad Sequentiam* 'Laus harmoniæ':

'Post tanta talia per eum patrata Christi magnalia,  
Nonagenaria nouena addita transacta iam vita,' &c.

This, however, Mr. Frere (p. 233) does not print *in extenso* as it may be

The same cause may partly account for the inclination to use a certain class of words with a Greek origin manifest in these earlier rhythms :

*'Theologa categorizant symbola nobis hæc  
ter triperita per priuata officia ;  
Plebs angelica, phalanx et archangelica,  
principum turma, virtusque uranica,  
ac potestas almiphona.'*

And in other parts of the same Sequence ('Ad celebres') we notice 'symphonia,' 'odas,' 'pneumatum' (of the angels), and (of the Trinity),

*'Eiusdem Sophia, compar quoque Pneuma, una  
permanens in usia,'*

besides 'dragma,' 'agalmata,' 'harmoniaë,' 'hyperlyrica,' 'thymiamata,' and some naturalized Græco-Latin words. Many other of the earlier Sequences have words of the same class, and one of these in hexameters has the line

*'Athanatos, Kyr[i]os, Theôn patôn cratôn, et Ysus,'*

and ends with 'doxa.'

Many years ago, when we showed the last-mentioned composition ('Alma chorus') to Mr. Henry Bradshaw, he remarked, '*That is such a Sequence as Dunstan may have sung.*'

Turning to the Winchester Troper we notice, accordingly, that the hexameter, so rarely found in sequences, is the most common form for the tropes : *e.g.* (p. 32)

*'Inter apostolicos stōla splendente [h]ierarchos : . . .*

*Ad'elwolde pia prece nos defende misellos : . . .'* &c.

interlarded in the Introit ; and the like in many an Introit, 'Gloria in excelsis,' Communio, &c. It is not the only metre. There are elegiacs for St. Swithun (p. 29) ; and see, for instance, verses prefixed to the 'office,' and other tropes on St. John's Day (pp. 8, 9), where hexameters are mixed with other verses, as also in the Christmas services earlier in the book, where the jubilatic line introducing the Introit of the Mass at Dawn (in the alternative form) breaks out in something looking very like a Græco-Latin cheer :

*'Hodie inluxit nobis dominus eya :  
ypane ypane ypane et eia.'*

found in *York Missal*, ii. 289, or in *Misset and Weale*, No. 435, vol. ii. p. 27. Each *line* of this Prose, and many others, ends in A.

As to Greek words : 'spermatis,' 'sophia,' 'pneumate,' 'paraphoniste,' are not far to seek. The 'Christi nomina summi' of the Sequence cited above are paralleled in the Kyrie (p. 48):

'Adoneus *kyrrius* dominus *kyrrion* chriteleison.

Hel, *sother*, saluator, messias, *christus*, unctus, *rucha*, *pneuma*.'

More interesting, perhaps, is the entire 'Gloria in excelsis' in Greek (p. 70); parallels to which may be found in the Greek Creed in the tenth century Troper at St. Gall, and the 'kiri ipile' (χαῖρε ἡ πύλη) and 'ymera agiasmini' given by Mr. Frere (pp. 89*n.*, 97), and the peculiar bilingual rites of catechumens and the dedication of a church, and in the Reproaches. He cites other examples from the Troper at p. xxvi.

Upon another very interesting point the editor likewise touches in his Introduction—namely, the Dramatic Dialogue of the Easter Sepulchre ('Quem queritis'), mentioned in the *Regularis Concordia* of St. Ethelwold. This may be considered to be one of the forerunners of the Miracle Play, the representations at Oberammergau, and of the Western Drama generally; and its counterpart at Christmas no doubt explains the charges in the Lincoln accounts in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries: 'For gloves bought for the Mary, Angels, and Prophets on Christmas morning in *aurora*, 6d.'<sup>1</sup> The dramatic element has now, happily, been transferred from the churches almost entirely to the secular stage, and perhaps the only vestige of such performances which can be found in the later Gradual is the semi-operatic arrangement of the long Stories of the Passion in Holy Week, where the part of our Saviour is assigned to the bass, the evangelist's narrative to the 'mean,' or tenor, and the voice of the Jews or the disciples is the alto. Where the Latin Mass is now sung, the contralto is called *ancilla*, because to it are assigned the words of the maid in St. Mark xiv. 67, 69, &c. (which go to the alto in Sarum books); and the choir represent the multitude.<sup>2</sup>

The Troper, besides dealing with the Mass, contained some passages relating to Responsds and other portions of the Divine Office of the Breviary, partly by right as tropes, partly for convenience (*Winchester Troper*, pp. 93-8). Also the Easter 'Laudes' or acclamations, following the Collect, and beginning 'Christus vincit,' which are known also as the

<sup>1</sup> *Lincoln Dio. Magazine*, October 1894, pp. 150-1.

<sup>2</sup> In *Graduale* 1528, fol. 89, five voices are distinguished for the Passion. For the three, see *Missale*, p. 264.

Coro  
were  
proc  
p. x  
melo  
repea  
artic  
the p  
Grad  
in ty  
'ad p  
which  
was t  
cials  
were  
Tona  
comb  
Offici  
and  
Mr. I  
'near  
Mr. F  
are fo  
system  
(Plate  
the p  
uttere  
pany  
discus

<sup>1</sup> E  
<sup>2</sup> M  
<sup>3</sup> S  
and C  
a-p for  
Herefo  
'List o  
Liturg  
which  
<sup>4</sup> V  
before  
of Litu  
donens

Coronation Litany of Q. Matilda (*ib.* pp. 130, 174).<sup>1</sup> There were tropes for the 'Responsds' or 'Proses' in certain festal processions, which last are marked in the Breviary (cf. *ib.* p. xi n.), and here the old custom survived of singing the melody over once with the words or Prose supplied, and then repeating it with the old *jubilum* or music, as a song without articulate words. The old manuscript Graduale included also the processions before Mass; but by the time when the Gradual began to be printed there were many Processionals in type, so that the new Graduals were able to dispense with 'ad processionem,' 'ad introitum chori,' &c. Another thing which it was found convenient to combine with the Troper was the 'Tonale,' or conspectus of the eight modes or 'officiales toni,' wherein the 'authentic' and 'plagal' modes were arranged for the Introits belonging to them. Such a Tonale, 'secundum usum Sarum et universalis ecclesiæ,' is combined with the fourteenth century 'Breviarium Divini Officii' and 'Directorium Missæ' which belongs to the Dean and Chapter of Salisbury.<sup>2</sup> The tones (summarized by Mr. Frere, p. 62) have the queer artificial words 'noeagis,' 'neane,' &c. &c., forming a *memoria technica* for the inflexions.<sup>3</sup> Mr. Frere explains at p. xi. the 'Romanian letters' which are found in his facsimiles, and draws attention to another system of letters employed in the *Winchester Troper* (Plates 22, 25), 'side by side with the neums, to fix accurately the pitch of the notes.' But we recall the timely warning uttered once upon a time by a veteran liturgiologist in a company of Ritualists, when they showed signs of straying into a discussion on ecclesiastical music, 'Let us not touch *pitch*!' <sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> England's *Explanation of the Holy Week*, 1833, p. 42.

<sup>2</sup> Maskell, *Mon. Rit.* ii. 85; and see *Missale Westmonast.* ii. 714 n.

<sup>3</sup> See Mr. Lunn's article on Music in *Dict. Christian Antiq.*, Smith and Cheetham, pp. 1351, 1361-2. For a specimen of the use of the letters a-p for the two octaves of the diatonic scale, see a facsimile (from the *Hereford Noted-Breviary*) issued with the first fasciculus of Mr. Frere's 'List of English Manuscripts of Music and Liturgy' (*Bibliotheca Musico-Liturgica*), which we have mentioned at the head of this article, and which we are glad to welcome.

<sup>4</sup> We little thought when we penned these words last Advent, that before they could be in the reader's hands the loyal and genial Lucullus of Liturgies, the Rev. William John Blew, editor of the *Breviarium Aberdonense*, scholar, liturgician, and hymnologist, would have passed away.

## ART. VII.—EVOLUTION AND MAN'S PLACE IN NATURE.

1. *Christianity and Evolution.* By JAMES IVERACH, M.A., D.D., Professor of Apologetics and Exegesis of the Gospels in the Free Church College, Aberdeen; author of *Is God Knowable?* &c. (London, 1894.)
2. *Evolution and Man's Place in Nature.* By HENRY CALDERWOOD, LL.D., F.R.S.E., Professor of Moral Philosophy, University of Edinburgh. (London, 1893.)
3. *The Lowell Lectures on the Ascent of Man.* By HENRY DRUMMOND. (London, 1894.)

IT is with a deep persuasion of the difficulties involved in any attempt to solve the mystery of creation and of man that we approach the study of these three volumes. Their appearance almost simultaneously is not a little remarkable, as testifying to the influence which the Evolution dogma exerts, and to the anxiety felt in different directions to reconcile or to adjust its claims with those of Christian truth. Nor is this any cause for astonishment when we consider how vast are the pretensions of Evolution, and how largely contemporary thought is saturated with its technical phrases. In a former article<sup>1</sup> we dealt with the extraordinary confusion of thought which is generated through the attempts to trace, not merely a growth which bears some analogy to that of biological development throughout the various provinces of human knowledge—the world of inorganic matter, the world of life, the world of humanity—but to insist upon an identical working of evolution through them all equally, and to assert that exactly the same process has guided the varied forces and controlled the totally distinct conditions of the worlds of matter and of mind. Against such a transference of ideas and processes, derived from the study of one branch of science, to the entire field of human knowledge, we then entered our most emphatic protest, and we abide still by the position which we then deliberately assumed. We are confirmed, moreover, in our judgment by finding that each of the works before us is convincing and conclusive in proportion to the independence of its author from submission to the evolutionary craze. Whilst Dr. Iverach combats, as we shall see, with singular perspicacity and acuteness the fundamental

<sup>1</sup> See *Church Quarterly Review*, January 1894—'Natural Theology and Evolution.'



and essential principles of Evolution, and Professor Calderwood shows the serious gaps in continuity over which Mr. Drummond skips with suspicious agility, the latter is yet constrained to introduce, under the vague nomenclature of 'environment,' that continuous guidance of the Divine Will and Purpose which Theism since the days of Darwin has constantly affirmed and Evolution has consistently denied.

Before we proceed to the examination of the works before us, we wish to make our own standing-point unmistakable. We are not influenced in our determined hostility to Evolution, as defined by its foremost advocates, by any distrust of science, or any apprehension for the safety of Catholic Christianity. We are firmly persuaded that dogmatic faith in the eternal verities of the Gospel will eventually and always prove to be consistent with unhesitating acceptance of all clearly established scientific truth, and with this conviction it is impossible to us that God's revelation of Himself in His Word should belie His self-manifestation in His works. For a time there may appear to be a contradiction between some asserted scientific discovery and some current interpretation of Holy Writ, but the Christian can afford to wait in patience for the fuller light which will be revealed in due season. At the first proclamation of the action of the law of gravitation it was eagerly welcomed by the sceptics of the day, under the impression that it tended to disprove the teaching of the Bible. But such groundless expectations soon died out and were forgotten. It is not, then, to any scientific discovery, or to any working hypothesis, which may be suggested as the probable explanation of its development within *its own sphere*, that we take exception, but to the unwarrantable assumptions and deductions which are based on such hypotheses, and which arrogate for a working theory the supremacy of indisputable and universal truth. We take our stand on the side of Christianity against Agnosticism, of Freedom against Determinism, of Theism against blind hazard, of Catholicism against a half-grudging Deism. We object *in toto* to the acceptance of any mechanical theory of the universe as ultimate, not because of any imperfection in its working, but because of the fundamental imperfection of its conception. We object *in toto* to the strange yet too common mistake which concludes, as soon as the method of any process is unfolded, that God did not do it. On the contrary, we regard every fresh demonstration of the universal prevalence of law as a fresh testimony to Theism, and a fresh

argument for God as the source of order and the only ground of law.

Nor will such an attitude be deemed unreasonably hostile or aggressive by those who realize the issues which are at stake. It is not too much to say that the foundation truths of the Christian faith are assailed under the mask of the evolutionary dogma. The doctrine of the Father is destroyed by the denial or the perpetual banishment of a personal God, and by such obliteration of the distinction between matter and spirit as makes Nature the efficient cause and end of all things. The doctrine of the Son is undermined by the rejection of the supernatural, which relegates the miraculous to the land of fable, treats the cardinal truth of the Resurrection as the product of an enthusiastic phantasy, and acknowledges in our Blessed Lord only the perfected natural man. The doctrine of the Holy Spirit and His procession from the Father and the Son is superseded by the theory that any renovation effected in man or in the system to which he belongs must be wrought out by agencies innate in Nature, and must proceed according to her fixed and unchanging laws. We do not say that so much is affirmed in explicit terms, but it is inevitably implied in the demands set forth in the name of Evolution, and in the scarcely veiled contempt with which any plea for the Catholic faith, as hitherto believed and understood, is regarded. Early Darwinism had been content to assume Evolution as a working hypothesis, but it was rapidly promoted, first to the rank of the most comprehensive of all phenomenal laws, and then to the throne of absolute supremacy over all Nature. Evolution is to rule everything, to account for everything, to explain everything; and that which lies beyond its influence belongs to the unthinkable and unknowable.

That this is no exaggerated assertion is clearly brought out in Dr. Iverach's opening pages:

'On all hands,' he writes, 'men are busy tracing out the lines of Evolution from the general to the particular, from the simple to the complex, until it is affirmed "that the whole world, living and not living, is the result of the mutual interaction, according to definite laws, of the powers possessed by the molecules of which the primitive nebosity of the universe was composed."<sup>1</sup> It is evident enough that, in these views of Professor Huxley, Evolution has passed beyond the stage of a working hypothesis, and has become both a philosophy and a dogmatic faith. We are restricted to molecules, their powers, and the interactions of their powers, for the explanation of the universe;

<sup>1</sup> Huxley, *Life of Darwin*, ii. 210.

when the molecules are given in their primitive nebulosity, the whole result follows. There can be no increment from without, no guidance from above, nor any leading along a definite line to a predetermined end. The molecules and their interactions must be competent to produce all that has come out in the process. We need not say how great is the issue involved in this claim, or how strenuously it is to be resisted. It is something gained, however, to have the claims of Evolution considered as a dogmatic faith stated so clearly, and to know with what we have to deal.<sup>1</sup>

Extravagant as these claims unquestionably are, there is much reason to fear that they are in a certain and a very injurious degree allowed by men who yet hold fast the profession of their Christian faith, if not without wavering. In consequence they occupy an indefensible position which cannot be upheld on either philosophical or Scriptural grounds. On the scientific side of their nature they are not very refined materialists, and they keep all their spirituality for their religion in a separate part of their life. They do not attempt to reconcile the antagonism which this dualistic creed engenders. Perhaps they are hardly conscious of its existence, or have never thought it out. But the day may come when they are hard pressed to defend their position, and it will be well if faith be not shipwrecked, although the fault lies not in their creed but in their science. For it is but too often the case that men reach their scientific convictions through the exercise of their reason, whilst their religious convictions are rather emotional than rational, and when a conflict arises between that which is *believed* to be true, and that which is only *felt* to be good and noble, the result is moral unrest, and possibly spiritual paralysis and decay.

It is time, however, that we turned from these general principles to consider the three works on Evolution now before us. Their authors represent with approximate adequacy three separate lines of treatment. Each of them avowedly writes from the stand-point of a believer in Christianity, and upholds after his own fashion the doctrine of Evolution. Each of them approaches his subject from a different point of view; Dr. Iverach embracing in briefer space a larger area than his fellow-workers, and giving a rapid yet singularly discriminating *résumé* of the entire relation of Evolution to Christianity; whilst Professor Calderwood strictly confines himself to the question suggested by his title; and Mr. Drummond gets no further in the *Ascent of Man* than the rudimentary evolution of a father. The three works, taken

<sup>1</sup> *Christianity and Evolution*, p. 2.

together, afford a signal example of the ambiguity which frequently lurks under terms of wide acceptance, and whose meaning is assumed to be matter of ordinary knowledge. Broadly stated, Evolution and Theism are in distinct antagonism, and the explanation which Evolution offers of the universe consists in avoiding the question of its origin, and starting from a primitive and chaotic nebulousity it deduces from so unpromising a commencement an orderly totality of molecules, whose mutual interactions have developed, without any subsequent interference *ab extra*, the existing state of things: the whole order of progress having been a development of the higher from the lower, the organic from the inorganic, the animal from the vegetable, the human from the animal, the mental from the material, the rational from the instinctive, in one unbroken series. Motion, life, reason, religion, none of them admitting of such a break in continuity as would be caused by the introduction of fresh creative energy. Such is the ideal which we presume Mr. Drummond accepts, but which Dr. Iverach and Professor Calderwood utterly deny, and yet the two latter accept (in a qualified sense) the name of Evolution. Let us inquire in what degree they receive it.

We regard Dr. Iverach's *Christianity and Evolution*, despite the small space within which it compresses discussion of the profound vital and fundamental questions which its title suggests, as a valuable contribution to the Theistic controversy. It is not often that the reader meets with a work on abstruse problems at once so witty and so wise, or finds the path by which he is led on through mazes of philosophical and scientific thought illumined by so firm a grasp of the real principles at stake, or by so felicitous a perspicuity in the statement of them. Power of expression in clean-cut intelligible phraseology is no contemptible standard of a writer's mastery of his subject, and Dr. Iverach's pages abound in such terse golden sentences, as well as in merciless analyses of the confusion of thought, and of the subtle intermixture and transference of ideas from their proper spheres to one of an entirely different nature, which characterize the works of some eminent apologists of Evolution. Here are a few examples, taken almost at random: 'When vital energies are split into processes like those of the non-living world, the essential nature of the matter in hand is lost in the splitting' (p. 92). 'The general laws of matter will never account for particular effects, and the particular arrangements are just the things which need to be explained' (p. 77). 'The per-

sisto  
per  
find  
syst  
of t  
the  
the  
uns  
cha  
as v  
On  
in c  
to c  
in t  
a g

dwe  
Fir  
mar  
exp  
leng  
wh  
orig  
The  
swal  
grou  
com  
cons  
ficat  
natu  
reali  
expl  
furn  
impo  
Butl  
force  
vival  
Dr. I  
and  
the v

'I  
schen  
posed  
the r  
table

sistence of force does not explain the direction in which it persisted' (p. 71). 'The system of efficient causes which we find at work in the world is just as anthropomorphic as the system of final causes is' (p. 65). Mr. Herbert Spencer's *Law of the Instability of the Homogeneous* is self-contradictory; for the two terms of the so-called conception will not unite. If the homogeneous is homogeneous it is stable, and if it is unstable it is not homogeneous. Also when we read his chapter on the 'Multiplication of Effects,' we see it might as well have the name of the 'Multiplication of Causes' (p. 29). On the denial of intelligence by Mr. Spencer and his followers in creation, he observes that 'ultimately the argument seems to come to this: there are so many evidences of intelligence in the universe, that we must therefore infer the absence of a guiding mind' (p. 86).

It hardly comes within the scope of the present paper to dwell upon Dr. Iverach's examination of Mr. Herbert Spencer's *First Principles*, which have become indisputable axioms to many evolutionists, but whose questionable character is ably exposed. Many doubtful positions, which might pass unchallenged as items in a working hypothesis, are seriously hurtful when accepted as irrefutable, and they carry the taint of their origin into the wider generalizations which are built upon them. The theory of the 'primitive nebulosity,' which many writers swallow blindly, is liable to grave objection upon scientific grounds. The dogma that universally the effect is more complex than the cause (though useful, if not essential, to the consistent evolutionist) does not seem capable of logical justification. Under the clever manipulation of scientific writers, natural selection—itsself only a metaphor—quickly becomes a reality capable of doing anything. In studying the attempted explanation of the world, which Evolution undertakes to furnish, and in estimating its adequacy, it is of the first importance constantly to remember the words of Bishop Butler, 'Abstract notions can do nothing.' Persistence of force, instability of the homogeneous, natural selection, survival of the fittest, are all abstract notions that do nothing, as Dr. Iverach reminds us, until they part with their abstraction and get themselves translated into the concrete energies of the world as we know it.

'How did the order, the intelligibility, the rationality of the scheme get into the universe, or the atoms of which it is composed? One can understand how the order, the intelligibility, the rationality got into the works on chemistry, lying now on the table; for the rationality is in Ostwald, in Williamson, in Armstrong,

first, and in the books next ; but the order, the rationality, the intelligibility of the atoms and the system they serve to produce are vastly greater than those of the systems in the books. . . . The intelligibility of a book has at least two references—one to the author of it, and another to the reader of it. Shall we say that the intelligibility of the world has only one reference—namely, to the reader of it ?' (pp. 42-3).

Dr. Iverach indulges in some pardonable sarcasm upon the temper as well as the substance of current evolutionary teaching upon the intricate questions of psychology. It builds largely, he remarks,

'on physiology, which explores the nervous system for physical concomitants of psychological events. It is great in the cross-examination of babies, and of late years has dealt largely with the possible experiences of the primitive man. . . . It is always of opinion that a process of becoming explains the result. Many other wonderful things might be said of it. Alliance with Evolution has not improved it, but the alliance has enabled it to do more wonderful things than ever. It has enabled Mr. Spencer to suppose that he can manufacture intuitions and produce necessary principles as they are needed, and to explain how what is *a priori* to the individual may be *a posteriori* to the race. As if repetition, custom, habit, could ever generate a belief in principles that are universal and necessary ! But perhaps the greatest feat ever performed by psychology is performed by Mr. Spencer when he affirms, "Not only do feelings constitute the inferior tracts of consciousness, but feelings are in all cases the materials out of which, in the superior tracts of consciousness, intellect is evolved by structural combination."<sup>1</sup> That is something worth knowing ! Consciousness, Mr. Spencer repeatedly says, is built up of individual sensations and emotions. The simplest element of consciousness is compared to a nervous shock. Given a nervous shock, or repeated nervous shocks, and by combining and re-combining these in endless ways, consciousness is built up ; for Mr. Spencer sensation and feeling are equivalent expressions. But, may we ask, what is it that is aware of the nervous shock ! Make feeling as simple as we may, before it becomes feeling, or when it becomes feeling, there is a something which is aware of it. The lowest organ is one ; it has a unitary centre somewhere, which reacts against the stimulus and the sensation. But Mr. Spencer deals with feelings as if they existed apart from a creature whose feelings they are. By a process of combining and recombining them he endeavours to build up a consciousness ; but the consciousness is the condition of their existence. *Feeling presupposes consciousness, and yet it is assumed that feeling makes consciousness.*'<sup>2</sup>

Professor Calderwood brings to the discussion of man's place in Nature the powers of a mind trained in the school of

<sup>1</sup> *Psychology*, i. p. 192.

<sup>2</sup> *Christianity and Evolution*, pp. 163-4.



psychological inquiry. He is consequently free from the tendency, so often manifest in writers on natural science, to slur over the broad chasm which divides the highest form of animal intelligence from the lowest stage of rational life. There is no attempt in his pages, as in those of Mr. Drummond, to represent the former as gradually shading into the latter until man is degraded to the level of a highly cultured animal, and the brute creation is represented as the embryo of reasoning humanity. On this fundamental and crucial question his testimony is clear and unwavering. 'A theory of "natural selection by accumulation of slight modifications of structure" has a clear answer as to the origin of the difference in form between the ape and the dog; but the theory has no such clear answer as to the origin of the difference of intelligence between the ape and man' (p. 60). 'Rational life is one, whatever its variations, and this because rational power is the basis for the life, however great the variations' (p. 63). And the contrast becomes more deeply marked as our grasp and survey includes a wider sweep of the conditions to which each is subjected. 'In the case of animals we see them mastered by environment; in the case of man, we witness a mastery over environment impossible in the history of lower life' (p. 80). Nor is the mystery of rational being diminished by the study of craniology or by any demonstration as yet achieved of the action of the nerve-system.

'As convolutions and cells and intra-cranial relations have been brought under observation; as the intricate demands of co-ordination within this elaborate central organ have been considered; as we have contemplated distribution of all the sensory impressions, and transference of these to the complex muscular system, it has become increasingly clear that the demands on the central organ for the maintenance of the integrity of an organic life are such that the still more complicated and varied activities of the reflective life cannot also be concentrated here. They stand before us unexplained. *There is not even a beginning made with an explanation of the higher phenomena of the rational life.* Biology, rich in its possessions as to structure and functions, is destitute of possessions concerned with the activities of intelligence. . . . Science, by its advance, has completed the demonstration of its own insufficiency to account for the rational power, and for the grand consequences in Nature, which have followed upon the appearance of rational life within it. This demonstration is also the demonstration of the insufficiency of a theory of Evolution' (pp. 278-9).

In the *Ascent of Man* we come upon a work of very different character, and of truly portentous claims. Mr. Drummond arrogates to himself the modest task of readjust-

ing all contemporary thinking. To his mind Evolution was given to the world out of focus, was first seen by it out of focus, and is so seen up to the present hour; and it is his vocation to redress the obliquity of vision thus universally prevailing. Nay, so imperfect has been the presentation of Evolution by all his predecessors, that its very nature has been *misconceived, and its greatest factor has been overlooked.* It is with no little misgiving that the critic ventures to touch the masterpiece of one whose penetration has discovered *the greatest factor* that eluded the unwearyed and trained observation of Darwin, the keen and dashing penetration of Huxley, and the philosophic acumen of Herbert Spencer. Justly may such a man exclaim, 'Exegi monumentum ære perennius.' Yet, as we write, a freak of memory suggests one slight misgiving. Some years ago a correspondent of the *Times* informed the public of his discovery that half the coal consumed for domestic purposes could be saved by using fireballs of clay; and as the economy thus effected would amount to many millions sterling, he modestly hinted that the nation should give him a *proportionate* reward. Needless to add, the asserted discovery was a complete delusion; and the would-be benefactor of mankind sank back into the ranks of ordinary men. Yet, however imperfect the presentation of Evolution by the inferior pens which have hitherto portrayed it, in Evolution as readjusted and refocused, as conceived and corrected by himself, Mr. Drummond's faith is illimitable. Never was there a more signal example than that afforded by the *Ascent of Man* of an author's squaring his proofs to his conclusions instead of confining his conclusions to his proofs. If the facts do not accord with the theory, so much the worse for the facts. No doubt it can be pleaded that in his endeavour to remodel and revolutionize every principle which has hitherto prevailed on the distinction between the physical and the psychical, Mr. Drummond's purpose and desire has been to engage the artillery of science in the defence of a Christianity itself remodelled as the exigences of asserted scientific discovery demand; but we hold such a proceeding to be full of the danger so admirably expressed in Mr. Balfour's brilliant *Notes on the Foundation of Belief*. The reader will follow, *mutatis mutandis*, the line of Mr. Balfour's argument, only substituting the evolutionary for the rationalizing theologian in the following passage:

'The theologian,' he writes, 'has borrowed the premises, the methods, and all the positive conclusions of Naturalism. He ad-

vanc  
oper  
run  
will  
certa  
a tie  
will  
artifi  
snap  
eithe

Drum  
is m  
esta  
the  
of M  
lute  
evol  
is ut  
it is  
acco  
it rig  
men  
it is  
goal

I  
auth  
elem  
be in  
beau  
of p  
anale  
the a  
sense  
lute  
follow  
the h  
ways  
reade  
the v  
holde  
speci  
Life

'p  
phane

vances on the same strategic principles, and from the same base of operations. And though he professes by these means to have over-run a whole continent of alien conclusions with which Naturalism will have nothing to do, can he permanently retain it? Is it not certain that the huge expanse of his theology, attached by so slender a tie to the main system of which it is intended to be a dependency, will sooner or later have to be abandoned; and that the weak and artificial connexion which has been so ingeniously contrived will snap at the first strain to which it shall be subjected by the forces either of criticism or sentiment?' (*loc. cit.*, p. 182).

It will no doubt be replied that this tie by which Mr. Drummond binds his Christianity to the Evolutionary system is not slender, and that the connexion he endeavours to establish is neither weak nor artificial; and this we allow is the main point at issue. But before discussing some details of Mr. Drummond's book it is important to realize the absolute antagonism of his position to that occupied by other evolutionists of note. Evolution, according to Mr. Huxley, is utterly and hopelessly immoral, brutal, and relentless; and it is man's duty to resist it with all his might. Evolution, according to Mr. Drummond, displays to the eye that reads it rightly the germ—we had almost written the full development—of morality before even animal life was evolved; and it is man's privilege to work with it gratefully towards the goal of the highest ethical attainment.

It is a marked feature of the *Ascent of Man* that its author reads into each branch of his subject in turn that element of reason or morality which he aims at showing to be innate in it. In passages of exceptional and transparent beauty, Mr. Drummond details the various stages in the life of plant and inferior animal, and draws from them, not the analogy which illustrates the true basis of human ethics, but the actual presence of moral qualities from which the common sense of mankind has hitherto considered them to be absolutely and entirely cut asunder. Take, as an example, the following description of the function of the flower of one of the higher phanerogams. It is a typical example in more ways than one of Mr. Drummond's method; and let the reader ask himself whether it is not a singular illustration of the well-worn adage that 'beauty is in the eye of the beholder.' It is taken from the chapter which deals with a special feature of his work: namely, 'The Struggle for the Life of Others.'

'Pass,' he says, 'from the unicellular plant to one of the higher phanerogams, and the self-sacrificing function is seen at work with

still greater definiteness, for there we have a clearer contrast with the other function. To the physiologist a tree is not simply a tree, but a complicated piece of apparatus for discharging, in the first place, the function of Nutrition. Root, trunk, branch, twig, leaf, are so many organs—mouths, lungs, circulatory system, alimentary canal—for carrying on to the utmost perfection the Struggle for Life. But this is not all. There is another piece of apparatus within this apparatus of a wholly different order. It has nothing to do with Nutrition. It has nothing to do with the Struggle for Life. It is the flower. The more its parts are studied, in spite of all homologies, it becomes more clear that this is a construction of a unique and wonderful character. So important has this extra apparatus seemed to science, that it has named the great division of the vegetable kingdom, to which this and all higher plants belong, the Phanerogams—the flowering plants; and it recognizes the complexity and physiological value of this reproductive specialty by giving them the place of honour at the top of the vegetable creation. Watch this flower at work for a little, and behold a miracle. Instead of struggling for life it lays down its life. After clothing itself with a beauty which is itself the minister of unselfishness, it droops, it wastes, it lays down its life. The tree still lives, the other leaves are fresh and green; but this life within a life is dead. And why? Because within this death is life. Search among the withered petals, and there, in a cradle of cunning workmanship, are a hidden progeny of clustering seeds—the gift to the future which this dying mother has brought into the world at the cost of leaving it. The food she might have lived upon is given to her children, stored round each tiny embryo with lavish care, so that when they waken into the world the first helplessness of their hunger is met. All the arrangements in plant-life which concern the flower, the fruit, and the seed are the creations of the struggle for the life of others.<sup>1</sup>

We do not question the beauty and lucidity of this description, but we hold it to be in large measure pure romance and utterly misleading. In what intelligible sense can it be affirmed that the flower *lays down its life*, or that it *clothes itself with beauty*; that it *gives to its children the food it might itself have lived upon*, or that it makes a *gift to the future* of its hidden progeny? No words, indeed, can be too eulogistic in which to express the wonder—the miracle, as Mr. Drummond justly terms it—which plant life displays, or in which to depict the exquisite arrangement that culminates in the production of the seeds; but, whereas the advocates of Evolution on the one hand are but too apt to neglect the truth that behind organ and function, with their mutual adaptation, there lies the mind which purposed them both and fitted them together, the Christian biologist and evolutionist, to our

<sup>1</sup> *Ascent of Man*, pp. 291-2.

thin  
plan  
argu  
infl  
for u  
But  
the c  
is de  
iden  
limit  
the h  
for f  
weak  
work  
M  
Argu  
stran  
The  
of ev  
goes  
stand  
found  
calm  
is giv  
the I  
for h  
remo  
defici  
logica  
no st  
of rea  
the a  
'cann  
unwri  
its fir  
which  
we as  
necess  
before

Th  
exam  
study  
and t  
VOL

thinking, will not redress the balance by thus attributing to plant life deliberate action, choice, and self-sacrifice. The argument from analogy is one that exerts considerable influence over the mind, and there is the highest authority for using it within the boundaries of its legitimate application. But in employing it it is exceptionally important to remember the caution *Ne quid nimis*, and the whole force of the analogy is destroyed if it be so unduly pressed as to confound it with identity. It is in this failure to recognize such necessary limitations, in his tendency to read the essential qualities of the higher order into the lower, in his substitution of fancy for fact, and of romance for reality, that Mr. Drummond weakens what might, by more cautious handling, have been worked into a very powerful line of reasoning.

Mr. Drummond calls his volume a History and not an Argument, and the assertion is but one example of the strange misuse of words in which the *Ascent of Man* abounds. The term history can only be legitimately applied to a record of events which have actually occurred, but Mr. Drummond goes to his imagination for his facts, and the trifling circumstance that some of his most detailed descriptions have no foundation in ascertained reality is no stumbling-block to the calm assurance of his narrative. Thus, for example, when he is giving the long-drawn account of the Dawn of Mind or of the Evolution of a Mother, he admits that he has no basis for his portraiture in any record that has reached us from the remote period which his theory demands, but so trifling a deficiency is of small importance. In all other processes of logical ratiocination the chain of argument is admitted to be no stronger than its weakest link; in the evolutionary mode of reasoning the entire absence of essential links is no bar to the acceptance of a foregone conclusion. 'Mind,' he pleads, 'cannot be exhumed by Palæontology or fully embalmed in unwritten history'; but for all that 'it *must* have risen into its first prominence during a long, silent, and dateless period which preceded the era of monumental records' (p. 163). If we ask why it *must* have so risen, the only answer is the necessities of Evolution require it. Evolution is the despot before whom all objections must bow—

'Sic volo, sic jubeo, stet pro ratione voluntas.'

The line of reasoning here pursued affords a crucial example of Mr. Drummond's method, and is worth minute study. First he states that the problem is almost insoluble, and the passage from the material to the mental involves

a hopeless break in continuity. To the reader, whose mind is thus thrown off its guard, he next suggests that names weighty in the realm of science can be quoted in support of the theory that there may be traces of development from animal to human intelligence; he then proceeds to detail what are the gradual steps through which the ascent of Mind may thus possibly be traced; until, finally, the impossible has been shaded into the probable, and the probable into the inevitable, as we have just seen—the mind *must* have risen into its first prominence during a long and dateless period.

The reasons assigned for this genesis of the Dawn of Mind appear to us altogether incapable of bearing the strain to which Mr. Drummond subjects them. We have not space to analyse them all, but we may devote a few paragraphs to their consideration. The first illustration is taken from the Mind of a little child, and the argument is founded upon the *admitted* fact that mind in Man does not start into being fully ripe and upon the *asserted* order and equivalents of its development. But we fail to see how the undisputed truth that mind dawns, and grows, and mellow, and decays—in other words, that it is subject to the general conditions of all cosmic life—casts any light on its evolution from a lower state of being. Although in childhood the mind is not fully developed, it is there potentially—there, under the mysterious conditions which render it largely dependent on physical concomitants, liable to be arrested in its development, or even to be destroyed—there, in all the fulness of its wondrous powers, which only need the proper environment to bring them out in high relief. The fact that a child's intellectual faculties are only gradually developed can cast no more light upon the genesis of mind than the fact that his bodily strength is only gradually developed can explain the origin of muscle. Growth, as the condition of life already transmitted, is no explanation of the method in which life was evolved.

A similar objection will apply to the author's illustration from the mind of savages, where he again confounds in the strangest fashion the totally distinct subjects of origin and environment. The mind of savages, so far as we can gather under the light afforded by the testimony of those who have had the deepest and fullest knowledge of them, is exactly the same in all its essential qualities as the mind of the civilized races, and it only needs a like civilized environment to bring this fact out into startling prominence.



No doubt amongst the obscure influences of heredity we can discern the transmission of intellectual tendencies handed down in greater or less degree from parent to child, but this is only an example of the variety in unity which is universal in the cosmos, and does not touch the question of origin. All this is, indeed, allowed by Mr. Drummond, who himself refers to the rapid advance of the Sandwich Islanders in contrast with the still degraded condition of the aborigines of North Queensland, and furnishes the reader with eloquent paragraphs on the dwellers in primeval forests—people 'who live like wild things on roots and berries and birds and wallabies, and in the monotony of their life and the uncouthness of their Mind represent almost the lowest level of humanity' (p. 183). But despite its uncouthness the *Mind* is there, and the mystery of its origin is as inscrutable as ever.

Nor is the evolutionary theory of the development of mind any better confirmed by the elaborate effort to trace its connexion with, and its gradual ascent from, the intelligence of the higher animals. Mr. Drummond borrows from Mr. Romanes's *Animal Intelligence* and *Mental Evolution in Animals* a series, including over a score of asserted items of emotional development, and varying from the elementary sensation of fear in the Annelids to the perception of the Ludicrous in the anthropoid apes.

'This list,' he goes on to explain, 'is something more than a bare catalogue of what human emotions exist in the animal world. It is an *arranged* catalogue, a more or less definite psychological scale. These emotions did not only appear in animals, but they appeared in this order. Now to find out order in Evolution is of first importance; for order of events is history, and Evolution is history. In creatures very far down the scale of life—the Annelids—Mr. Romanes distinguished what appeared to him to be one of the earliest emotions—Fear. Somewhat higher up, among the Insects, he met with the Social feelings, as well as Industry, Pugnacity, and Curiosity. Jealousy seems to have been born into the world with Fishes; Sympathy with Birds. The Carnivora are responsible for Cruelty, Hate, and Grief; the Anthropoid Apes for Remorse, Shame, the sense of the Ludicrous, and Deceit' (pp. 168-9).

It is noteworthy in the opening sentence of this quotation how deftly Mr. Drummond assumes the very thing it is his task to prove—namely, that they are *human emotions* which have been observed in the lower animals: to say nothing at present of the further difficulty that the catalogue runs through the entire scale of human emotions, and even includes those whose names—such as cruelty, remorse, and bene-

volence—connote and inevitably imply marked ethical elements. A few sentences lower down the author admits that these emotions are only in the lower animals in some sense: 'That they are not there in the sense in which we think them there is probably certain' (p. 170). Then why so much insistence upon an argument which is fundamentally misleading? There is no proof that because one finds the same muscular contraction of forehead or of optic nerve in the monkey and in man that there is also the same subjective state; but this, which the whole argument assumes, is incapable of proof. 'The outward signs may seem,' as Dr. Iverach remarks, 'to be identical, but the inward feeling may be as wide as the poles asunder' (p. 159). Far more worthy of the true spirit both of science and of philosophy is the caution given by the same thoughtful writer against the rash identification of things essentially different in their kind than Mr. Drummond's method of insinuating that there is, despite such difficulties, a residuum of connexion sufficient to permit us cautiously to reason from.

How essential and fundamental is the distinction between animal and human emotion is admirably shown in the following extract from *Christianity and Evolution*, which we quote, not merely as bearing directly upon the point we are considering, but also because it is suggestive of a broad and powerful line of argument, which is too commonly overlooked in discussions of this character:

'That which is what it is in relation to a whole,' says Dr. Iverach, 'is to be judged in relation to the whole of which it is a part. And an emotion is to be judged in relation to the being in whose experience it is a factor; and thus the emotion partakes of the character of that being, and will increase in complexity in proportion as the experience consists of more or less elements in relation to the whole. Thus the emotion of a being who has not attained, and who never will attain, to self-consciousness can scarcely, to any profit, be compared with the emotions of a being who is potentially at least self-conscious from the beginning' (p. 159).

There is a further consideration, touching the comparison of animal and human intelligence, the importance of which has not, to our knowledge, been adequately recognized—namely, that the highest intellectual attainment reached by the animal creation is the consequence and result, not of more elaborate brain structure, but of closer association with mankind. In conformation of brain the anthropoid ape, if we are rightly informed, approaches most closely to the human cranium, but in intelligence it is far inferior to the sheep-dog which guards

and marshals the flocks on the Cheviot Hills. Yet in this instance it is the intellect of the shepherd which has preceded and moulded and developed the intellect of the collie ; so that any argument based on such examples for a supposed derivative of man's intelligence from that of the brutes is simply putting the cart before the horse. And this view of the matter is further strengthened if we are to accept the latest conclusions of Sir Charles Lyell about the antiquity of man's appearance on the earth, conclusions which have been claimed as valuable support for the Evolution Theory. But, as Professor Calderwood justly argues, the force of reasoning flows in the opposite direction. The earlier we place the arrival of man, the larger must be the effect which human agency has wrought in natural history. Geological records would seem to require us to extend human history to a period before the appearance of the dog, to which evolutionists now specially refer for evidence of pre-human animal intelligence.

The truth is that the theory of 'natural selection by accumulation of slight modifications of structure' affords no clue to the origin of the difference of intelligence between man and the higher animals, and Mr. Drummond's case breaks down on its biological side, the very ground on which he holds the evidence to be most conclusive.

'In the field of comparative research,' writes Professor Calderwood, 'the rational life of man is the outstanding event for which there is no adequate scientific explanation. The perplexity for the theory of "natural selection" is that anatomical structure and physiological law fail to provide for the higher functions. Hitherto we have been able to trace functions to organic structure. By penetrating into minutest details of structure, watching with microscopic aid the faintest movements, and recording, by help of the finest instruments, speed and volume of movement, physiological science has placed beyond question the relations of structure and function. But we are now reaching a point where the light fails, where the voice is silent. Looking at life, as it is concerned with knowledge, apart from muscular activity, we have come to a knowledge which cannot be attributed to the sensory system any more than it can be attributed to the motor system. Research into brain structure carries no explanation. Our nerves can no more explain its origin than our muscles can. Physiology never has made any account of human knowledge, not finding in physical structure and function anything promising help as to its acquisition. Research into brain structure has not helped us towards identification of the source of physical science.

'Localization of function in the brain has made large advance. Centres of sensibility have been identified, so also have motor centres ; and even centres for localization, providing for the language

of dogs and of monkeys, as well as of men. But there has been no advance towards localizing of "thought centres," such as might produce science. It is true, and to be specially noted here, that electric excitation of brain has failed to find the functions of certain "silent" portions of the brain, but these "silent regions" are found in the brains of lower animals also, and to none of the animals have we attributed high rationalizing powers' (*Evolution and Man's Place in Nature*, pp. 60-2).

We question whether in any book professing to be written on scientific principles, one too whose author displays considerable acquaintance with many branches of science, so strange a farrago of actual fact and unauthorized fiction was ever set forth as in the two chapters of the *Ascent of Man* entitled the Evolution of a Mother and the Evolution of a Father. Their contents almost defy analysis, owing to the inextricable blending in them of truths which all Christian men acknowledge, and in which they recognize the providential guidance of God, with theories devised to elaborate that gradual unfolding of the affections which thorough-going and unflinching Evolution demands. Revelation tells us that God, according to the counsel of His own will, determined to make man in His own image, and who that believes this can doubt that man came forth as a related whole, with a unity of being, in full possession of the emotions which should enable him to love his Creator and his fellow-men—i.e. in the terse and striking phraseology of Holy Scripture—a living soul? Mr. Drummond assures us that man first appeared as a non-descript, almost on a level with the beasts, and that he gradually developed by accumulation of microscopic differences, certain particles of feeling which Natural Selection fixed upon and finally welded into ethical emotions. Revelation tells us that He who made them in the beginning made them male and female, and implanted in them a powerful bond of union. Mr. Drummond informs us that for untold ages the relation of the human sexes was so entirely bestial that it probably involved a pairing season, and if we understand him right, that primitive humanity was even so devoid of the higher instincts of the brute creation, that for it love

'was not existent in Man and was frozen in Woman, until one day from its Mother's very heart, from a shrine which her husband never visited nor knew was there, which she herself dared scarce acknowledge, a child drew forth the first fresh bud of a love which was not passion, a love which was not selfish, a love which was an incense from its Maker, and whose fragrance from that hour went forth to sanctify the world. Later, long later, through the same tiny and un-

*conscious intermediary, the father's soul was touched.* And one day, in the love of a little child, father and mother met' (p. 391).

The authority for the statement of the 'lineage of love' thus circumstantially and authoritatively laid down is based on the study—'*is proved*' is Mr. Drummond's own expression—by the *simplest study of savage life*. On the validity of the alleged proof we may have something to say presently; but in order to present Mr. Drummond's case in one connected view we must give some further illustration of the growth of the affection thus elicited:

'The only thing,' he writes, 'that could bear the heavy burden of social order and adapt itself to every change and fresh demand was the indestructibly solid, yet elastic, strength of love. *The care and culture of love, therefore, became thenceforth the first great charge of Evolution, and every obstruction to its path began to be swept away.* Whatever facilities could further its career were gradually adopted, and changes which soon began to pass over the face of all human societies seemed but parts of one great conspiracy to hasten its final reign. For a prolonged and protective Fatherhood, once introduced into the world, *was immediately taken charge of by Natural Selection.* . . . [Eventually the Father] is not only protector but food-provider. It is impossible to believe that in process of time the discharge of this office did not bring some faint satisfactions to himself, that the mere sight of his offspring, fed instead of famished, did not give him a certain pleasure. And though the pleasure at first may have been no more than the absence of the annoyance they caused by the clamorousness of their want, it became a stimulus to exertion, and led in the end to rudimentary forms of sympathy and self-denial' (pp. 393-95).

It would require far more space than we have at command fully to unravel the tangled knot of fact and fiction of which this attempted explanation is composed; but we may mark some of its ingredients. It is pure assumption to assert that the simplest study of savage life proves anything; its deeper study suggests many problems which thoughtful men have found almost insoluble, and savage life has been reasonably held to be rather a degradation from a higher state of being than a primitive condition. It is pure rhetoric to assert that Evolution and Natural Selection, personified with capital initial letters, take charge of anything or sweep any obstruction from its path. It is true, indeed, that 'through the ages an increasing purpose runs,' yet an adequate cause for advance is not to be found in abstractions, but in the Intelligence which designed the progress here attributed to them. It is a truism that moral qualities may be cultivated, and that there may be growth in sympathy and self-denial and affection

but if the qualities so described are worthy of the dignity their names connote, they must be the result, not of some blind unintelligent force which gradually enriches mere automatic and unconscious action, but of rational and self-conscious effort, and the problem to be solved is the existence of this very rationality and self-consciousness, and this problem Mr. Drummond's wordy explanations leave untouched. The entire history is simply Evolution run mad, fantastic in conception, and fanciful in execution. We have heard of the decillionth part of a suspicion, but never before of 'the thousandth part of a smile.' The only parallel we can recall to Mr. Drummond's lineage of love is the grinning cat in *Alice in Wonderland*, in which the cat disappeared, but the grin survived.

Before concluding we must not omit to notice one objection which may be urged to our criticism of the *Ascent of Man*. It may be said we have failed to notice the many qualifying remarks which are interspersed throughout its pages, as well as the great importance which Mr. Drummond attaches to the influence of environment. We allow the former plea without hesitation. A running comment of qualifying observations is interpolated in the text. They may serve to indicate the mind of the writer, but they do not, in our judgment, lessen the mischievousness of his work. We hold the basis of it to be unsound, and the superstructure consequently insecure. Again, we allow that Mr. Drummond assigns an almost overwhelming importance to environment, in which he includes the omnipotence of God; and, as we read this admission, we are fain to ask to what purpose is all the writer's labour? No one, we presume, questions that the universe may be accounted for by all the inner forces and all the outer forces that have gone towards its production. To call all the inner forces Evolution and go to your imagination for a description of their mode of action, and to call all the outer forces Environment and leave it undefined, is to give an explanation which explains nothing, and 'the reconstruction of the ultimate' remains as unattainable as ever.

---

LIT  
to  
sym  
cov  
of li  
use.  
felt  
base  
rest  
anti  
mad  
of c  
the  
foll  
Aria  
doub  
not  
Yet  
perh  
take  
comp  
and,  
for s  
doctr  
teen  
appr  
sort  
doctr  
patro  
been



ART. VIII.—PSEUDO-MOZARABIC OFFICES.

1. *Oficios Divinos y Administracion de los Sacramentos y otras Ordenanzas en la Iglesia Española.* (Madrid, 1881.)
2. *Oficios Divinos y Administracion de los Sacramentos y otros Ritos en la Iglesia Española Reformada.* (Madrid, 1889.)
3. *The Revised Prayer Book of the Reformed Spanish Church* [As Authorised by the Synod of that Church, May 1889]. Translated by R. S. C., with an Introduction by the Most Rev. LORD PLUNKET, D.D., Archbishop of Dublin. (Dublin, 1889.)

LITURGICAL scholars who look upon their study with an eye to practical requirements must always be disposed to sympathize with honest and straightforward attempts to recover for the service of the Church liturgies, or even portions of liturgies, which in the lapse of centuries have fallen out of use. Such attempts are welcomed in proportion as they are felt to be real; and as they show a sincere desire for a true restoration upon ancient lines, and give evidence of being based upon a sound knowledge of, and respect for, Christian antiquities. For the books now lying before us a claim is made that they are based upon the Mozarabic rite. It may, of course, be remarked that even if the claim to be based upon the Mozarabic liturgy be established, it will not of necessity follow that these liturgical books must be orthodox. The Arian liturgy of Dr. Samuel Clarke published in 1774 is no doubt based upon the Book of Common Prayer; but it would not for a moment be accepted by any who are not Socinians. Yet those best acquainted with the Mozarabic liturgy may perhaps be a little surprised to find the Mozarabic avowedly taken as the basis of a Protestant liturgy. It is the most complicated and hard to unravel of all the ancient liturgies; and, one would think, the least fitted of all to serve as a basis for simple Protestant worship. There is also nothing in its doctrines which favours the errors of the sectaries of the sixteenth or nineteenth centuries; it has been more than once approved by the authorities of the Roman Church; but some sort of hope that this rite may be found to countenance the doctrines of Zwingli and Calvin is, we fancy, at the root of its patronage by the sects in Mexico and elsewhere. It has not been suspected that the doctrines of the Real Presence and

of the sacrifice in the Eucharist, of the regeneration of the infant by baptism, with the practice of prayers for the departed, of fasting, and the public reading of the Deuterocanonical books of the Old Testament may all be found in the Mozarabic liturgy, not only as it has come down to us at the present day, but in the earliest accounts of it that we meet with in the Spanish Fathers. A liturgy containing such doctrines and practices is not likely to meet with much approbation from Protestant Dissenters in England and elsewhere; and when it becomes known to them that such are its contents, a reaction may not unnaturally be looked for.

To gain a satisfactory acquaintance with the Mozarabic liturgy the student must of necessity betake himself to the original sources, whether in manuscript or in print. One of the earliest and most important accounts of it is in the treatise *De Ecclesiasticis Officiis* of St. Isidore of Seville, who died in A.D. 636, a work which has been often reprinted.<sup>1</sup> Another valuable source of information is the collection of the canons of early Spanish councils which have been brought together by John Pien in his treatise on the Mozarabic liturgy;<sup>2</sup> last and most valuable of all are the Missal and Breviary of the Mozarabic liturgy which were first printed by Cardinal Ximenes in 1500 and 1502 respectively. These are now extraordinarily rare. Mr. Weale in his *Catalogus Missalium* in 1886 was able to collect only ten copies of the Missal; but there are many more than these to be found in libraries in different parts of Europe. The Ximenes editions, however, though extremely important, are not absolute necessities to the Mozarabic ritualist. The Missal was reprinted at Rome in 1755 with great care by Alexander Leslie, an Aberdeenshire man: and again by Arevalo at the same place in 1804, at the expense of Cardinal Lorenzana. This cardinal had previously reprinted at Madrid in 1775 an edition of the Breviary, said to be not so accurate: and published also a little book for the use of the Mozarabic chapel in Toledo with the title: *Missa Gothica seu Mozarabica* (Angelopoli, 1770.) This latter was reprinted in 1875 at Toledo. In 1883 the bulk of this edition was kept under the fixed seats attached to the wall in the Mozarabic chapel in Toledo, and a copy brought out when a customer appeared. It is not a

<sup>1</sup> We have used Arevalo's edition of St. Isidore, published at Rome at the end of the last century.

<sup>2</sup> In Jos. Bianchini's edition of the Blessed Cardinal Tommasi (*Opera Omnia*, Romæ, 1741, t. i. p. i). See also the Bollandist *Acta Sanctorum*, St. James's Day, July 25.

Mozarabic Missal, as the Archbishop of Dublin would appear to believe,<sup>1</sup> but it contains one Mass, that of the festival of St. James the Great, and the Little Hours as said in the Mozarabic chapel; so that it partakes of a hybrid character, partly Missal and partly Breviary.

Unfortunately, manuscripts of the Mozarabic rite are rare; and Lorenzana by his description of them (Breviary, 1775, preface, p. ix) encourages the idea that they cannot be readily deciphered. Such Mozarabic manuscripts, however, as we have seen, are written in a clear large Gothic hand and could be transcribed with very small experience in palæography. Such ancient manuscripts, it is true, are not easily to be found in Spain. The Spaniards seem greatly to enjoy the sport known at our oldest public school as *πέμπε*; and Father Dreves also sadly describes his wanderings from one Spanish chapter library to another, sent on fruitless errands, under a burning sun, in search of manuscripts.<sup>2</sup> In the last century Father Burriel (a member of the Society of Jesus, to which order the Mozarabic rite is under very great obligations) prepared a fresh edition from manuscripts, especially those in the Toledo chapter library, which appear to have furnished the basis of the Ximénian editions. His transcript and notes are still preserved in the National Library at Madrid, and they extend over many folio volumes. They do not, however, seem to have been consulted by Señor Cabrera; he would have found in these collations material that would have been very useful for a book honestly based upon the ancient Mozarabic manuscripts; but he has contented himself by repeating the remarks of Lorenzana that the Mozarabic manuscripts are incomplete and occasionally illegible, as an excuse for not having availed himself of information that lay close at hand in Madrid.

To show the harvest that may be reaped by a diligent worker among the Mozarabic manuscripts we may point out that within the last two years an important addition to our knowledge of Mozarabic liturgical books has been made by Dom German Morin, who has published a lectionary of the Church of Toledo, written, it would appear, in the eleventh century. With it is also a Spanish calendar of nearly the same date.<sup>3</sup>

It is still an open question whether indeed the Ximénian

<sup>1</sup> *Guardian*, January 2, 1895, p. 9, col. ii.

<sup>2</sup> Guido Maria Dreves, *Hymnodia Hiberica, spanische Hymnen des Mittelalters* (Leipzig, 1894), 'Vorwort,' p. 6.

<sup>3</sup> *Liber Comicus sive Lectionarius Missæ quo Toletana Ecclesia ante*

editions have been much interpolated. Eugenio de Robles,<sup>1</sup> writing only a hundred years after Ximenes, suggested that the Missal had been interpolated from the Romano-Toletan Mass book formerly in use in the diocese of Toledo, a book which bore the same relation to the pure Roman rite that our Sarum book did. This idea was taken up by the well-known French ritualist Pierre Le Brun,<sup>2</sup> and he thought it possible to separate the pure Mozarabic from the interpolated *Ordo Missæ* of Ximenes by taking out all that was common to the book of Ximenes and the Romano-Toletan Missal. He also rejects the Ximenian rubrics and certain other parts on internal evidence. But his results must be accepted with caution, though he has been followed by writers like Leslie and Dr. Neale.

For further comparison we have also the documents of the Old Gallican liturgy which is so closely akin to the Mozarabic that some writers have asserted that the two are identical. Whether, indeed, they be the same is a question that is open to dispute; but that they are very closely allied must be admitted by all. Abbé Duchesne in his *Origines du Culte Chrétien* supplies at once from the Mozarabic the *lacunæ* that occur in the Old Gallican, and *vice versa*.

Looking back upon our sources of information upon the Mozarabic rite it will be well to remember that we have only the printed Missal and Breviary as texts of the liturgy: that is, we have only the forms for the services corresponding to the celebration of the Holy Eucharist, and the choir offices. For the other sacraments or sacramentals, such as baptism, confirmation, orders, consecration of churches, matrimony, extreme unction and visitation of the sick, burial of the dead, or other Christian rites there exist no printed Mozarabic *formulæ*. Keeping these facts in view, let us now consider the Reformed Prayer Books the titles of which are given at the head of this article.

Of the English version of Señor Cabrera's book we fear we can say but little in praise. If read aloud in England it would be enough, as the French say, *à faire fendre les fenêtres*. As an instance of the diligence with which it follows the rules of grammar we may note that hardly an opportunity has been missed, when translating, of dividing the infinitive and inserting an adverb. A moderate acquaintance with eccle-

*annos mille et ducentos utebatur*, edidit D. Germanus Morin, Maredsolii, 1893, in *Anecdota Maredsolana*, vol. i.

<sup>1</sup> *Compendio de la Vida . . . Ximenez de Cisneros*. Toledo, 1604.

<sup>2</sup> *Explication de la Messe*, Diss. v. Art. iii. (Paris, 1777, t. iii. p. 307.)

siastical terms is shown. 'Témporas' may be found to be 'ember day' in any Spanish dictionary: yet on p. 270 it is left untranslated. 'Las ofrendas' is translated 'offertory,' though it may be noted that Señor Cabrera has himself led the way by altering 'colectas para los pobres,' a perfectly simple and correct expression in the book of 1881, into 'ofertorios' in 1889. Before the proper collects, prophecies, Epistles and Gospels (p. 166) we are told that 'the choice has been made by Señor Cabrera, having before him the Mozarabic, Anglican, and Roman Breviaries.' It will be news to many of our readers that Breviaries contain the Epistles and Gospels of the Sunday. Those collects in the English Book of Common Prayer which we all know make their first appearance in history in the Gelasian or Gregorian Sacramentaries are simply labelled 'Anglican:' and altogether it must be owned that the edition does not give a very high idea of the learning and scholarship which surround the archiepiscopal throne of Dublin. Even Lord Plunket himself admits that the rendering is in places 'somewhat slovenly.'

Before approaching details, the principles on which the Spanish books claim to be compiled may be noted. On the forefront of all the editions we find as their motto the words from the prophet: 'Stand ye in the ways, and see, and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein.' So that at the very beginning of the book we are led to expect a most scrupulous regard for Christian antiquity. Clearly nothing but what is sanctioned by the old customs of the Church of St. Isidore will be admitted, if the motto be any indication of the contents of the book. In the 'preliminary observations' before the offices begin, we are promised also a rite characteristic of the ancient Mozarabic liturgy; but it may be well to let Señor Cabrera speak for himself about his work:

'It was natural, therefore, that we should resort to the old Spanish Rite, and this we have done. But the difficulties have been great. Existing ancient manuscripts are few in number, incomplete, and occasionally illegible, and the Breviary and Missal arranged and published by order of Cardinal Ximenes de Cisneros, besides containing many things of modern invention, do not supply all the materials necessary for the formation of a complete Book of Offices, seeing they lack such as refer to the Sacraments and other Christian rites usually incorporated in Rituals and Pontificals.

'In the careful examination of these documents we have found abundant materials for certain Formularies ['Fórmulas'] but an

<sup>1</sup> *Guardian*, Jan. 23, 1895, p. 137, col. i.

almost entire absence of matter for other essential Offices ; hence, to complete our work, we have resorted [‘nos hemos visto precisados á recurrir’] to the Formularies of Reformed Churches, and frequently to the Word of God itself.

‘With these fountains before us, and drinking from all of them, we have compiled the present Book of Offices, which, while not differing from the general character exhibited by the Liturgies of the Reformed Churches, retains the characteristics and peculiar traits of the old Spanish or Mozarabic Rite’ (pp. 2 and 3).

In the Spanish edition of 1889 on p. 2 it runs thus :

‘El presente Libro de Oficios, que sin desdecir de carácter general que ostentan hoy los de las Iglesias reformadas, *conserva los rasgos característicos y peculiares del antiguo Rito Español ó Muzárabe*’ [in edition of 1881, p. ix. it runs: ‘todos los rasgos característicos . . . Muzárabe, que son compatibles con la Palabra de Dios’].

The writer seems certainly to wish us to understand that his book preserves the main characteristics of the Mozarabic rite: that its backbone, in short, is Mozarabic. And this seems to be the interpretation put upon his words by the Archbishop of Dublin in his preface to the English version. On p. xvii his Grace heads a section with the words: ‘The Mozarabic Rite taken as a model,’ and adds: ‘That, to a considerable extent, these offices do reflect the more striking features of the Mozarabic Rite, will, I think, be generally admitted.’ Such, indeed, has been generally asserted by the supporters of Señor Cabrera in these islands. A correspondent of the *Guardian*, (Oct. 24, 1894, p. 1669, col. iii.) writing under the name of ‘Zenas,’ complains that it has been said that the English Prayer Book has been taken as the basis of Señor Cabrera’s book; he asserts on the contrary that ‘the whole construction of the services is quite different, and any one will see who studies the book that the Mozarabic rite, a national Spanish liturgy, and not the English Prayer Book, is the basis on which the book is constructed.’

So, too, the address of certain Nonconformist ministers to the Archbishop of Dublin says, speaking of Señor Cabrera and his followers :

‘These men have set before their minds as their model their own early Spanish Church, with the Scriptures in the vernacular, with its ancient pure Mozarabic Liturgy, and its democratic episcopal government. . . . Where existing forms, hallowed by centuries of use, can be made the channels of Gospel truth, and of grace, their retention is not only justifiable but desirable.’<sup>1</sup>

Archdeacon Farrar, in a vehement oration in support of

<sup>1</sup> *Times*, Friday, February 1, 1895, p. 7, col. iv.



the Archbishop of Dublin in the Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury, stated that the Spanish Reformed Prayer Book 'was based on the ancient national Mozarabic use, and was closely assimilated to our own.'<sup>1</sup> How these two characters can possibly coexist, the learned Archdeacon did not explain; but it may be remembered that eloquence rarely condescends to be exact and scientific.<sup>2</sup>

In view of these statements by Señor Cabrera, the Archbishop of Dublin, and other of his supporters it would seem that it would not be displeasing to them if an inquirer after the new Reformed community were led to the belief that in the Spanish Prayer Book he had a tolerably accurate representation of the services used in Spain in early times: and that in taking his child to be baptized or confirmed, or when he went to be married, or when he took his dead to be buried, much the same services would be used by Señor Cabrera as those that were used in Spain during the first thousand years after Christ. If he were to act on this belief, and should afterwards learn the true state of the case, he would certainly be greatly disappointed. We have already said that we have the printed Mozarabic forms only for the Eucharist and the choir offices; and of the thirty or more offices contained in Señor Cabrera's book only one can be said to show any characteristics and peculiar traits of the Mozarabic rite; and even in this one instance the office is greatly interpolated with Anglican forms. The great majority are the Anglican offices,<sup>3</sup> usually, it must be said, changed for the worse, set between *formulae* taken from various parts of the Mozarabic Missal and Breviary, which have no connexion with baptism or confirmation, churching of women or matrimony, visitation of the sick or burial of the dead. The Mozarabic rite has been used as a source whence the fringe or trimmings of the offices might be derived, but not for the purpose of supplying their principal material, or even of

<sup>1</sup> *Guardian*, February 13, 1895, p. 252, col. iii.

<sup>2</sup> The Archdeacon seems to have been upset by the title Señor Cabrera instead of Bishop Cabrera; but an English bishop without a see or a doctor's degree would very properly be called Mr. So and So. This snatching at petty titles is a note, it may be believed, of the democratic spirit of the end of the nineteenth century. We talk of President Jones, Senator Robinson, and Canon Smith when our forefathers would have said plain Mr. So and So. Every Roman Catholic priest delights as much to call himself a monsignor as an Anglican clergyman rejoices in the possession of an honorary canonry.

<sup>3</sup> By 'Anglican offices' is meant the offices in the Book of Common Prayer, or offices derived from that book, as are the Irish or American offices.

regulating their form. As a matter of fact the Mozarabic elements in all these offices might be taken away, and yet the provision made for things essential to the rite would remain almost untouched.

There are, however, in these offices certain small and unimportant features borrowed from the Mozarabic rite, of which much has been made, as they are likely to attract attention from those who are acquainted only with the Roman or the Anglican services. For example, instead of 'Glory be to the Father,' &c., as we have it, the Mozarabic rite has 'Glory and honour to the Father,' &c. This feature, absolutely unimportant in itself, yet certain to attract the notice of those who meet with it for the first time, has been most carefully preserved all through Señor Cabrera's book. So, too, the Mozarabic priest says 'The Lord be ever with you' and not merely 'The Lord be with you.' The collects, if we may call them so, have a double ending, with two *Amens*. These trifles, it will be owned by all, are not the characteristics of a liturgy. They find a place very properly in a restoration, but they do not confer upon the service in which they are found a Spanish character. 'Glory and honour to the Father,' &c., is found, for example, in the Bangor Antiphoner, which is of Irish origin, and elsewhere.

Some of these little Mozarabic peculiarities are noticed while others escape. In *Te Deum* special attention is drawn to the fact that an extra verse is added to the end of the usual text. That the ending of *Te Deum* varies considerably in the old texts is well known to liturgical students. So also the Mozarabic text contains a prayer to God to vouchsafe to keep us this day without *tribulation* and without sin; but though interesting, the fact is of no great practical importance. But another variation, found as far as we know in every printed Mozarabic *Te Deum*, has not been noted, and its omission shows a certain amount of carelessness or want of information, in view of the emphasis set on the other small variations. All the old texts, it is well known, read 'gloria munerari,' not 'gloria numerari;' it is 'in gloria munerari' in the Breviary of Lorenzana (p. cxxvii). Señor Cabrera has: 'sean contados en el número de tus santos' (p. 43), a translation of the modern Roman or Anglican text. Is there a doctrinal objection to the expression 'rewarded'? Then again it is carefully pointed out that the text of *Gloria in Excelsis* follows that of the Mozarabic Mass (see Leslie, p. 221), the same as that of the Roman Mass, and probably borrowed from the Romano-Toletan Mass book; but Señor Cabrera

has passed by the real text of the Mozarabic *Gloria in Excelsis*, differing both from the Anglican and Roman texts, though it lay before him in the Breviary (Lorenzana, p. cxxvii). It is claimed for the Spanish that it is a literal translation of the text in the Missal; but can 'on earth peace, goodwill towards men' ('en la tierra paz, buena voluntad para con los hombres') be a literal translation of 'Et in terra pax hominibus bonæ voluntatis'? A like obedience to Anglican forms is, however, not seen in the Nicene Creed, where the Church is acknowledged to be 'one, holy, catholic and apostolic,' though the 'Filioque' has been retained.

But leaving these textual variations, let us examine some of the 'offices' themselves. Let us consider the office for the initial sacrament of baptism. Señor Cabrera's 'Office for the Administration of Holy Baptism to Infants' begins with a few versicles and a prayer duly labelled 'Mozarabic.'<sup>1</sup> These, we find, are taken, not from any baptismal office, but from the office of Lauds on the Thursday after the fourth Sunday in Lent.<sup>2</sup> Then an anthem, 'Suffer little children,' is sung, immediately followed (rather late in the proceedings) by the Prayer Book question: 'Hath this child been already baptized or no?' At this point come two addresses containing reminiscences from the English Prayer Book, followed by a long prayer labelled 'New,' and having no points of likeness to the Anglican 'Almighty and everlasting God' and 'Almighty and immortal God,' which clearly do not contain doctrine sound enough for Señor Cabrera, though the former of these prayers is attributed to Dr. Martin Luther.<sup>3</sup> Then come the baptismal questions: 'Do ye acknowledge in the name of this child that he is bound to renounce the devil?' a strange form which runs through all the remaining questions 'adapted from the Anglican.' But now we come to an instructive and important part of Señor Cabrera's baptismal service: the blessing of the font. In the English Prayer Book, it is well known, the blessing of the font is claimed as proof that the Reformers were acquainted with the Mozarabic Missal. The passage in the Missal on Easter Even<sup>4</sup> is indeed singularly like that set in the First Prayer Book of Edward VI. for the blessing of the font: and it might have been thought that

<sup>1</sup> The sources, Mozarabic, Irvingite, Irish, Cabrera, Anglican, Swiss, Portuguese, 'Gallican,' New, are given in the margin of the Dublin translation, but not in the Spanish original.

<sup>2</sup> Lorenzana, Breviary, p. 276.

<sup>3</sup> See *Das tauff buchlin verdeutscht durch Mart. Luther* in Aem. L. Richter, *Die evangelischen Kirchenordnungen* (Leipzig, 1871) Bd. i. p. 7.

<sup>4</sup> Leslie, Missal, p. 188.

Señor Cabrera, closely following the Anglican rite in its order if in nothing else, might have been attracted by this little bit which the Anglican Reformers seem to have borrowed from the Mozarabic Missal. But no: the blessing is rejected for a new composition of Señor Cabrera's own, which is not a prayer for the blessing of the water, but for a blessing on the ordinance. It does not seem that either the Book of Common Prayer or the Mozarabic Missal is here in complete harmony with the views of Señor Cabrera, and this may be one of the instances of which he speaks in which the Mozarabic liturgy (and perhaps the Anglican) and with it all Christian antiquity are to be held as inconsistent with the Word of God.

Then comes the actual baptism. Nothing is said of trine or single immersion: and yet single immersion is a characteristic of the Mozarabic rite. It was ordered as a protest against Arianism by the fourth Council of Toledo, and such a national characteristic, one would think, should have found some notice in a book which exhorts us to 'look for the old paths and keep in them.'

After baptism has been administered we have a maimed following of the Prayer Book: 'We receive this child into the fold of the Good Shepherd, and do sign him,' &c. There is no 'Seeing now, dearly beloved, that this child is regenerate;' but: 'Brethren, let us now give thanks unto God, and with one heart and voice say the prayer which the Lord Himself hath taught us,' and the Lord's Prayer is then said in the Mozarabic manner, with 'Amen' after each petition. Then a prayer is said, 'adapted from Anglican and Gallican' which we hardly recognize; it avoids the returning of thanks for regeneration and incorporation into the Church. Then comes one of the Mozarabic benedictions and an address of Señor Cabrera's own, which ends the office.

This can hardly be called an unfair specimen of Señor Cabrera's method of constructing a 'Mozarabic office.' He takes two Mozarabic *formulae*, say a prayer or a benediction from the Missal or Breviary, of a perfectly neutral and colourless complexion, with only a distant reference to the matter in hand, be it baptism, matrimony, or some other rite, and sets these *formulae* at the beginning and the end of his service. He then takes the Anglican office, and, when necessary (as in the baptismal office), carefully weeding it of the sacramental or sacerdotal teaching of the Church of England, he inserts the mutilated Anglican office between the Mozarabic beginning and end. The casual reader takes up the service and sees it labelled Mozarabic at the beginning and end;

and a chance Lord's Prayer in the middle also, for the book claims as Mozarabic most of the *formulae* common to all Christians; and the reader thinks that he is dealing with a service the basis of which is Mozarabic. He is not distinctly told that the *formulae* labelled Mozarabic come, not from a baptismal, matrimonial, or funeral Mozarabic office; but from some service, say, for the week days after the Epiphany, or in Lent. A certain reserve, an economy, in imparting information has been practised here. It would certainly have been more open and straightforward if the sources of the Mozarabic *formulae* had been plainly given, and the reader told that they did not come from a corresponding Mozarabic office.

This baptismal office also shows very plainly the disregard that Señor Cabrera has for the antiquities of his own Church and nation. For none other of the occasional offices are there, perhaps, better materials known than for the restoration of the ancient Mozarabic baptismal office. St. Isidore in his second book devotes five chapters to the description of the Spanish baptism. There is a work by St. Ildephonsus of Seville, *De Cognitione Baptismi*, which contains large fragments of a much earlier work by St. Justinian; and there are also some canons of the Toletan councils on this subject; but there is no evidence in Señor Cabrera's book that he has so much as looked at these early Spanish authorities. It has been already said that the Old Gallican liturgy is a sister rite to, if not absolutely identical with, the Mozarabic: and in the Old Gallican liturgy there is a full baptismal service,<sup>1</sup> which might have served for the office without alteration or borrowing. It contains, it is true, the section for the blessing of the font identical with that passage in the Mozarabic Missal which the Anglican Reformers adopted, but which Señor Cabrera has rejected. With this disregard of antiquity before us we may form some opinion upon the value of the statement made by the Nonconformist ministers addressing the Archbishop of Dublin: that 'these men [the Spanish Protestants] have set before their minds as their model their own early Spanish Church.'

If space would allow it, we might go in the same manner with the same result over the rest of Señor Cabrera's pseudo-Mozarabic offices. To take one or two more instances of neglect of Mozarabic offices when they lay close at hand:

<sup>1</sup> G. H. Forbes, *Ancient Liturgies of the Gallican Church* (Burntisland, 1858), pp. 188, 267. See also J. Mabillon, *De Liturgia Gallicana* (Lut. Parisior. 1685), p. 362.

there is an *officium infirmorum* in the Mozarabic Breviary<sup>1</sup> which one would have thought might have furnished matter for Señor Cabrera's 'Visitation of the Sick.' That, however, is a mixture of 'adaptations from the Anglican' and of Señor Cabrera; and we find that the Mozarabic benediction at the end is taken from the Friday after the Octave of the Epiphany.<sup>2</sup>

The *Agenda Mortuorum* of the Mozarabic Breviary being composed mainly of the Psalms and Holy Scripture might have given, it may be thought very properly and reasonably, a good many hints for 'the Order for the Burial of Adults' to Señor Cabrera. Yet it does not seem that he has altered his usual methods of construction in this case. The grace before meat of the Mozarabic Breviary<sup>3</sup> has been followed; but the prayer has been mutilated ('ut per manus Sancti Angeli tui sanctificata' has been left out), because it contains a reference to the ministry of a holy angel, who may be, indeed, the Holy Ghost Himself, for in ancient liturgies the word 'Angelus' is not unfrequently a title of the Third Person of the Holy Trinity.

Certainly one of the more striking features of the Mozarabic rite is its division of the ecclesiastical year; and a very small amount of acquaintance with the Mozarabic Missal and Breviary will show how greatly the Spanish Christian year differs from that of any other Church. To begin with Advent. The Mozarabic Advent extends over six Sundays before Christmas, a feature which might very appropriately have been reproduced in Señor Cabrera's book. But for some motive or other the Roman number of four Sundays only has been retained. So with the Sundays after Epiphany: the Spaniards formerly had eight, with no Septuagesima, or Sexagesima, or Quinquagesima; only one Sunday immediately before Lent began, *ante carnes tollendas*. Señor Cabrera has six Sundays after the Epiphany, with Septuagesima, Sexagesima, and Quinquagesima, following the Roman calendar. With these arrangements for the Christian year it has not been possible for Señor Cabrera to follow the old Mozarabic distribution of Scripture in the prophetic lesson, Epistle, and Gospel; at all events it has not been done throughout, as was quite feasible. In one place we notice that Leslie's suggestion that the services for the Sundays in Lent have been misplaced has been taken up as to the Lenten Gospels: but the necessary result of this action should have been the

<sup>1</sup> Lorenzana, Breviary, p. cxlv.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 105.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. cxliv.



omission of Ash Wednesday, which has never been kept in the Ambrosian rite, and it is plainly of recent introduction into the Mozarabic. The Anglican Epistles seem to have been the source of Señor Cabrera's Epistles in many cases, to the neglect of the Mozarabic; while the discarding by Señor Cabrera of that part of the Anglican 6th Article of Religion which teaches that the Deutero-canonical books are read by the Church for example of life and instruction of manners has brought about a rejection of the old Mozarabic distribution of the prophetic lessons, which again has caused a positive diminution in the amount of Scripture read; for the old rite had two prophetic lessons during Lent, and Señor Cabrera has only one. As early as St. Isidore the Apocrypha has supplied lessons for the Spanish Church service: and a canon of the Fourth Council of Toledo orders that the Song of the Three Children shall be sung every Sunday, an ancient custom which it says some have begun to neglect. Señor Cabrera is, however, much wiser than these ancient Fathers; and has purged his Prayer Book of *Benedicite*. Does he think it is superstitious, or 'contrary to the Word of God'? Better teaching than this hymn against the prevalent Manicheism of the day could not be imagined.

In the Mozarabic Missal the Sundays after Pentecost are no more than seven in number. Most likely when the seventh Sunday was reached, the Mass for the first Sunday was repeated, the series being begun again. But Señor Cabrera not only names his summer Sundays 'after Trinity' but supplies full services for twenty-six Sundays, the Epistles and Gospels of which correspond with those in the Irish Prayer Book.

What Mozarabic authority Señor Cabrera has for keeping Ember days is not set forth. St. Isidore makes no mention of them,<sup>1</sup> nor do they appear in the printed books of Cardinal Ximenes. There are, indeed, fasts of three or four days each at certain times in the year: we may mention those of the calends of January, four days before the Epiphany, those of three days before Pentecost, before the 14th of September, which is the feast of St. Cyprian, and before the 11th of November, the feast of St. Martin; but these are not the days on which the fasts of the four seasons are kept. The fact is that this is only one of the many points in which Señor Cabrera has introduced Roman details and paid no heed to the ancient Mozarabic calendar. One, printed by Francis de Pisa in 1595, has been reproduced by Alexander Leslie in his edition of

<sup>1</sup> There is no mention of the Ember days even in the severe monastic rule of fasting in cap. xi. of St. Isidore's *Regula Monachorum*.

the Mozarabic Missal (p. 629). Its age would seem to be considerable: for it contains no feast of the Exaltation of the Holy Cross on September 14; only St. Cyprian is commemorated on that day.<sup>1</sup>

But, as we have said, this calendar seems to have furnished no hints to Señor Cabrera. Señor Cabrera keeps the Annunciation on March 25; the early Spanish calendar kept it on December 18. The early Mozarabic calendar, with the Easterns, commemorated, most appropriately, St. James, the brother of the Lord, in the Christmas week; Señor Cabrera commemorates him, in the Roman fashion, with St. Philip on May 1. The early Mozarabic calendar has no feast of the Purification, or of St. Mark, SS. Philip and James, St. Barnabas, or of the Transfiguration; but these are noted by Señor Cabrera's book according to the Roman fashion. No services are, however, provided for these days; only a collect is to be recited before the collect of the day. There are no special prophetic lessons, Epistles, and Gospels as there are in the Mozarabic Missal for feast days. And we may be thankful for what we have, for in the edition of 1881 there was not even this collect, or any mention of the festivals of the martyrs.

The refusal to adopt the old Mozarabic calendar is an instance of the bondage of Señor Cabrera to the new Irish Prayer Book or the American calendar. There seems to be no reason why a calendar based upon the Roman should be adopted by a 'Reformed Spanish Church.' If any pretence of following Spanish antiquity be made, the ancient Mozarabic calendar ought certainly to be followed.

Further, nowhere in the calendar given by Señor Cabrera, and in no place in the book, do we find any hint that there is such a thing as the Christian duty of fasting. In the calendar the festivals of the Church of Ireland, supplemented by the Transfiguration from the American book, are given, but there is no list of festivals or fasts after the calendar, nor is the weekly fast of Friday or Saturday ever mentioned. Now in the ancient Spanish Church both the Friday, in remembrance of the Passion, and the Saturday, in remembrance of our Lord's lying in the sepulchre, were kept as fasts.<sup>2</sup> St.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. the calendar published by Dom German Morin in *Liber Comicus*.

<sup>2</sup> Friday was a fast day in Spain as early as A.D. 268. St. Fructuosus, Bishop of Tarragona, when led forth to be burnt on a Friday, refused a cup of wine because the time for breaking the fast was not yet come (Bollandist *Acta SS.* January, ii. 704). The Synod of Elvira (canon 26) held about A.D. 300 objected to fasting on Saturday, apparently a custom then prevalent.

Isidore<sup>1</sup> says the former was kept by some, the latter by most. Can any claim be made for Señor Cabrera that he takes the ancient Spanish Church as his model when there is no word in his book of a duty so universal and so prominent in primitive times as that of fasting?

We will now pass to the Eucharistic office compiled by Señor Cabrera; for we must not leave these Reformed Prayer Books without some examination of the order which they supply for 'the Administration of the Lord's Supper or Holy Communion;' especially as this is the service where we might most of all expect some real attempt to be made to take the ancient Spanish rite as a model, and to exhibit its characteristic features. It does, indeed, contain some traces of the Mozarabic rite: but its form, as regards its most essential parts, seems to be based on other models. This will appear plainly enough from an examination of the service in detail.

In the first place it is ordered in the 'Preliminary Observations' (§ vi.) that 'pure bread and wine are to be used in the Holy Communion' ('el pan y vino puros:' 1889. 'el pan puro y el vino sin mezcla:' 1881). Does the rubric of 1889 allow that water may be mixed with the chalice? There ought to be no need to ask such a question if the practice of the ancient Spanish Church or indeed of the Universal Church had been considered. St. Isidore gives the Spanish custom distinctly. Quoting from St. Cyprian, he says: 'calix dominicus vino et aqua mixtus offertur';<sup>2</sup> and from the Mozarabic Missal it is plain enough that water is to be used.<sup>3</sup> Yet here there is a doubt about the sanction of an ancient and wide-spread custom that may be called Catholic if anything can be called Catholic. Then leave is given to communicate, apparently, in any posture; kneeling is only allowed 'so long as this act is not performed as an adoration of the elements, or of a *supposed presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in them or with them.*' There is no statement like this in the Mozarabic rite. St. Isidore teaches us: 'Panis quem frangimus Corpus Christi est.'<sup>4</sup> As to holy places (§ viii.) there is a direction that 'at the Holy Communion there should be a Table (*una sola Mesa*) in the Chancel, not placed against the wall, but at a distance from it, so that the ministrant may stand between the Table and the wall, facing the Congregation.'

Much stress has been laid upon the direction that the

<sup>1</sup> *De Officiis*, lib. i. cap. xliii.      <sup>2</sup> *De Officiis*, l. xviii. 4.  
<sup>3</sup> Leslie, p. 219.      <sup>4</sup> *Loc. cit.* § 3.

ministrant is to stand at 'the Table' facing the congregation: and in the English version a note is added that 'this instruction is in accordance with the ancient Mozarabic usage.' The authority for this statement has been asked for; and the only evidence that was produced was a statement of Lorenzana, who, puzzled to account for the absence of many directions to turn to the people in the Mozarabic rubrics, suggested the hypothesis that in Spain, as in the Roman basilicas at the present day, the celebrant faced the congregation.<sup>1</sup> Based upon quite as good facts as those of Lorenzana is the explanation given by Mr. G. G. Scott of the same phenomena in the Roman rite, where, after the offertory, the priest is no longer bidden to turn to the people when saluting or addressing them. It is this: that the altar being shrouded in veils, and the celebrant thus hidden, it was a matter of indifference which way the celebrant turned.<sup>2</sup> But until it had been distinctly proved that the Roman basilican was the Spanish custom in the early centuries, no one had a right to assume the hypothesis of Lorenzana and still less to act upon it. It must first of all be shown that the Spaniards always had the same custom as at Rome in this matter, a proposition that will be hard to demonstrate. In the catacombs, which are earlier than the basilicas, the altars are so placed that the celebrant could only have stood before what we call the long west side of the altar, and the celebrant must have stood in the same direction as the congregation while celebrating the Eucharist. So little was what we call the basilican custom invariable in the early Church.

Besides, the evidence of St. Isidore and the earlier Councils is rather against than in favour of this view of Lorenzana. St. Isidore speaks of the priest standing before the altar ('Unde et Ecclesiasticus liber scribit stantem sacerdotem ante aram, et in circuitu eius coronas fratrum,' *De Offic.* I. iii. 2) where the Vulgate (*Eccles.* I. 13) uses the expression 'iuxta aram.' Further the Fourth Council of Toledo orders that the priest and deacon shall communicate 'ante altare,' the clerks in the

<sup>1</sup> Lorenzana, *Missæ Gothica seu Mozarabica* (Angelopoli, 1770), p. 132 (of the first pagination). There is also another commentator who asserts the same thing as Lorenzana, but he is apparently unknown to the supporters of Señor Cabrera, who again show a want of acquaintance with the whole case. (See F. J. Hernandez de Viera, *Rúbricas generales de la Missa Gothica-Muzarabe* (Salamanca, 1772), pp. lxlvi and lxlx). He adds nothing, however, to the argument, merely repeating the statements of Lorenzana, whom he often quotes.

<sup>2</sup> G. G. Scott, jun., *An Essay on the History of English Church Architecture* (London, 1881), p. 14.

choir, the people outside the choir. It may be asserted that 'ante' has here only the value of 'iuxta' or 'coram,' but it would seem to have a more definite sense. Besides, in Spain the analogy with the Roman basilicas fails; for the earliest Spanish churches, those built during the predominance of the Mozarabic rite, have square ends,<sup>1</sup> and not apses, as the Roman basilicas and mediæval Spanish churches have; and the chances are somewhat against a local Roman practice being Mozarabic. But supposing these considerations be put aside, it shows a certain lack of judgment to adopt an important ceremony on the mere *ipse dixit* of a commentator, without further evidence, or weighing of the question. In all likelihood, however, we should have heard as little of Lorenzana's opinion in this matter as in a good many others where he has expressed a much more decided view, if his hypothesis had not chanced to favour the practice very often adopted, we believe, at Presbyterian Communion tables. Was it known to Señor Cabrera that it is also the practice followed to this day by the Pope and his cardinals when they say Mass at the high altar of St. Peter's?

A white tunic or surplice may be worn by 'the Minister who officiates at Public Worship' (§ x.) and 'a band or stole' by a presbyter or deacon; but 'every other ecclesiastical vestment or ornament shall be excluded' except the black gown for preaching and funerals. This is precise: but what then is the 'episcopal habit' prescribed by the service for the consecration of bishops? and what are these rumours of 'Mozarabic copes' worn by Señor Cabrera? The word 'cope,' however, in some mouths, has an exceedingly elastic meaning.

We may next consider the text of Señor Cabrera's Communion service, which has claims greater than those of the other offices to be based upon the Mozarabic liturgy. Now, if we had been asked what were the characteristics and peculiar traits that distinguished the Mozarabic Mass from all others, Eastern and Western, we should have replied, first of all, the extraordinary fulness and abundance of the variable parts of the Mass, so that the fixed and unchanging part of the liturgy is but small. Even the prayer of consecration varies from day to day, only the paragraph containing the words of institution being invariable. Now of this daily variation of the Mass, characteristic of the Mozarabic, if anything be characteristic, we can perceive but little in Señor

<sup>1</sup> Smith and Cheetham, *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*, i. 384, .v. 'Church.'

Cabrera's Communion service. The variables are small in number; they are what he calls the introit ('officium' in the Mozarabic book) the three Scripture lessons, the laud (a thanksgiving after the Gospel) the collect (said after the offertory and before *Sursum corda*) the illation (our proper preface) and the blessing before Communion. If it be said that a larger amount of variables would render the service unwieldy and impracticable, the answer at once is that the Mozarabic Mass is this in its very nature, though if chosen and announced as a model, it should be followed without flinching. An objection, too, on the score of great variation can hardly be made by a society in which extempore prayer before sermon is allowed and even recommended.

The variable parts of the service retained by Señor Cabrera and claimed as characteristic of the Mozarabic liturgy may surprise at first by their unfamiliar names; but the things themselves when examined are soon recognized as forms by no means peculiar to Spain. An introit we most of us know; Señor Cabrera has been considerate in choosing the Roman rather than the Mozarabic name for a thing common to both rites. The prophecy, a third Scripture lesson besides the Epistle and Gospel, is not peculiar to the Mozarabic rite, but it is retained to this day in every Mass in the Ambrosian; and in the Roman rite it was formerly much more frequent than it is now. It is found also in Eastern liturgies. The Mozarabic laud is a short anthem of thanksgiving after the Gospel, and with some act of praise at this point we are most of us familiar at home. The illation is but another name for a proper preface with which formerly the Roman liturgy abounded to the same extent that the Mozarabic does. As to the place of *Gloria in Excelsis* before the service, that is by no means peculiarly Mozarabic, as a few minutes' investigation of liturgies will convince any one. It was a peculiarity of the second book of Edward VI. to move it to the end of the service, the place that it still fills in most Anglican liturgies. Of the form given to *Gloria in Excelsis* by Señor Cabrera we have already spoken.

Secondly, the Mozarabic Mass is complete and perfect in itself. There is no need to interpolate foreign elements. Even if it be admitted that it is desirable in adapting the Mass for modern use to diminish the variable parts, yet every necessary section of the service, be it Scripture lesson, collect, proper preface, or any other part, can be supplied from the ancient service itself. There is, indeed, over-abundance of material to choose from, and there are many sections as



neutral in doctrine as the American book, that could have been used as the fixed frame, and yet no offence given to Protestant supporters. Yet what has been done? Take the central part of the service, the importance of which Señor Cabrera marks by printing in large type. It is American. There are hardly a dozen words left in it that are Mozarabic. 'Christ the Lord and Eternal Redeemer,' which introduce the words of institution, are really almost the only pure Mozarabic expressions in this section. The rest is taken from the American prayer of consecration. The words 'blessed it' after 'and giving thanks' have been introduced into the edition of 1889, in accordance with the account in the Gospels of SS. Matthew and Mark. 'Amen' was added after each consecration in 1889. We have noticed that this is the custom of the chaplains at the Mozarabic Mass at Toledo, and it is a good custom in itself, and it has most likely some ancient Mozarabic authority; for though it is not distinctly enjoined in any copies or reprints of the Ximénian edition, yet we find it in two later editions of Mozarabic books; one printed at Salamanca<sup>1</sup> and the other the reprint of Lorenzana's small *Missa* in 1875. St. Paul's words, not exactly as they appear in the Mozarabic, are added after the consecration, 'As often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup ye do show the Lord's death till He come from heaven in glory' ('in claritatem de celis') the last four words are an addition from the Mozarabic. We then pass into a mutilated form of the American prayer of oblation and invocation, with very important words omitted and added.

Now for this contemptuous abandonment of the Mozarabic Mass in the very centre and kernel of the Eucharistic office we can discover no reason. A choice might have been made of a Mozarabic *post sanctus*, to be followed by the Mozarabic words of institution with a *post pridie* and *Te prestante*, which would form together a Mozarabic prayer of consecration. Could not Señor Cabrera find amongst the multitude of Mozarabic *formulae* for the prayers *post sanctus* and *post pridie* one not too pronounced in its sacramental teaching? It is a pity that he could not; for it seems to us essential for one who really took the Mozarabic liturgy as his model that no

<sup>1</sup> Francisc. Jacob. Hernandez de Viera, *Rúbricas generales de la Misa Gothica-Muzarabe* (Salamanca, 1772), p. lxix. Gams, in his translation, gives an 'Amen' after each consecration (*Die Kirchengeschichte von Spanien*, Regensburg, 1862, Bd. i. p. 110); Daniel, after the second consecration only (*Codex Liturgicus Ecclesiae Romano-Catholicae*, Lips. 1847, p. 87). Dr. Neale follows Daniel (*A History of the Holy Eastern Church*, Lond. 1850, pt. i. p. 557).

word should be imported from foreign rites into this most sacred moment of the whole service. But this choice of American *formulae* where Mozarabic were abundant shows a dislike and distrust of the ancient Mozarabic liturgy which is, we fear, a part of Señor Cabrera's character, while policy leads him to assure us that he has resorted to that liturgy as the foundation of his office. Señor Cabrera apologizes for being forced to borrow from foreign rites on account of the poverty of Mozarabic material for some of his offices. For his Eucharistic office such an excuse cannot be made; for he had before him superabundant material from one of the fullest and most complete of the ancient liturgies of Christendom.

The rest of the office, it must be owned, shows as little real respect for Spanish antiquity. By following the Mozarabic order, it is apparently hoped that the employment of Irish and American forms may escape observation. Offertory sentences, which do not exist in the Mozarabic liturgy, are borrowed from the Irish Prayer Book, to avoid the pollution of the passages from the Apocrypha which occur in the English Prayer Book, while the source of the offertory prayers borrowed from the Scottish liturgy is not acknowledged. The prayer for the Church militant comes after the offertory, as an intercessory prayer does come in this place in the Mozarabic; but only a few Mozarabic sentences are inserted in the Anglican form. 'Dearly beloved in the Lord,' with its decided teaching, has been cut down so that only the first sentence remains; but the Anglican confession and absolution may be recognized as the basis of Señor Cabrera's that follow the address. Even the Anglican comfortable words have been brought in between the Mozarabic 'Aures ad Dominum,' which is translated 'Hearken unto the Lord,' and 'Sursum corda': anti-liturgical influence is again shown by the omission of the Mozarabic *Benedictus* after *Sanctus*, with its 'Hagios' repeated, which is peculiar to the Mozarabic. The Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Benediction remain in their Mozarabic places, after consecration, though there is no rubric directing at the Creed the elaborate fraction of the bread, one of the most notable customs, not only of the Mozarabic rite, but of the liturgies of Gaul, and even of the British Isles. Nor is there any *Sancta Sanctis*, one of the most ancient and striking of *formulae* common to the Mozarabic with the Oriental rites. The Anglican words of administration, quite peculiar to the Anglican communion, are directed to be said; and there follows an adaptation of the prayer after Communion, 'Almighty and ever-living God,' which is made to end

up as if it were a Mozarabic prayer with the double 'Amen' and 'Through Thy mercy,' &c. The service ends with an Anglican blessing, marked Mozarabic. Señor Cabrera has been eager to expunge from his service any part upon which a slight critical suspicion rested, such as 'Adesto, adesto,' when that part favoured a doctrine which he did not accept; but he has here boldly introduced a final blessing which is not in the Ximenian text, though a final blessing has been interpolated in the two editions of the small *Missa* of Lorenzana (probably copied thence also by Hernandez in his book) suggested no doubt by the modern Roman practice. It will be seen how much we may trust to Señor Cabrera's consistency in refusing the modern and choosing the ancient.

A great deal more might be said of Señor Cabrera's treatment of the Mattins and Evensong of the Book of Common Prayer, of the English Litany,<sup>1</sup> of which Churchmen are justly so proud, of the very bad prayers before and after sermon, which forcibly recall to our minds the presbyterian period of Señor Cabrera's career: but we think we have given enough to enable our readers to judge for themselves of Señor Cabrera's method of manufacturing Mozarabic offices. We have spoken of them from the liturgical side mainly, leaving the theologians and the canon lawyers to deal with those doings of Señor Cabrera and his supporters that concern their sciences. But the result of a liturgical examination of these offices is sufficiently grave: and we trust, in the name of the ethics common to us all, that the claim made in behalf of these offices to be considered Mozarabic may at once be withdrawn. Archdeacon Farrar, in the speech in favour of Señor Cabrera which we have quoted, has told us that 'God is the God of Truth . . . There are some men so constituted that they would sooner die than lie; they would not go before God with the unclean sacrifice of a lie. To approach God with a lie in our right hand is equivalent to offering swine's flesh upon the altar.' This is excellent teaching; only let us act upon it. Let us have truth even in our Prayer Books. Yes, God is *not* to be served with a lie.

<sup>1</sup> Señor Cabrera has such a dread of prayers for the departed being insinuated under some neutral form that he has positively left out of his adaptation of the English Litany the words following that are in Italics: 'Remember not, Lord, our offences, *nor the offences of our forefathers.*' After this it need not be said that all prayers for the departed in the Mozarabic *formula* adapted by Señor Cabrera have been struck out. The very simple and primitive 'requiemque defunctis' has been left out after 'da sanitatem infirmis' in every translation of the Mozarabic emblem after the Lord's Prayer.

## ART. IX.—ILLINGWORTH'S BAMPTON LECTURES.

*Personality, Human and Divine : being the Bampton Lectures for the Year 1894.* By J. R. ILLINGWORTH, M.A. (London, 1894.)

THE Bampton Lecturer for 1894 has selected a subject immense both in compass and importance. It would deserve this description even if he treated it merely in the abstract. But he chose—and we heartily applaud his choice—to regard personality not merely as a question of metaphysics and theology, but as one of religion and of life, both intellectual and moral; to watch the progress of thought upon the mighty theme, to observe the place it holds in the stages of social progress from barbarism to civilization and in the various religions, heathen, Jewish, and Christian, and in the forms of revelation through nature, through prophecy, and through Christ. Nor does the great history stop even there; for the developments of the idea of personality in the course of Christian theology furnish a further stage of the subject as important as all that has preceded. The author is well equipped even for such a task; but it is impossible that within the space allotted to him he should discuss with thorough sufficiency every department of his theme. Though his treatment of each head is never superficial, yet we often have to pass away from a branch of the subject still hungry for more of the intellectual food which is so excellent in the portion we have. Personality in the hands of the great thinkers of Greece; personality in the Fathers and the Councils of the Church; personality in relation to the doctrines of evolution, are each of them subjects well worthy to be considered alone, and upon any one of which we could wish a treatise from so competent a hand, as large as the whole volume which deals with so many more branches besides.

But this is no fit ground of complaint. We have always to make our choice between comprehensiveness and detail, and the light which comes to us upon the parts of a great whole in the course of a general survey are often full of guidance which we should not have received from a longer sojourn in separate parts. In the admirable Fourth Lecture, in which the ancient arguments—Cosmological, Teleological, Ontological, and Moral—are restated for the author's purpose, we are bound to say that the treatment of each branch, though short, contains the matter of many a volume. We

have constantly found ourselves wishing that we could place the little treatise, though but a few pages long, in the hands of some thinker with whom we are acquainted through his books, and learn what he could say in reply.

But we are minded to essay the task of criticism rather than of eulogy, as the more useful and respectful both to the author and our readers. We are not, however, about to spend our time in showing what might have been said about points on which nothing more or better could have been said within the necessary limits. We shall choose quite another line, upon which, if we be right, our readers will allow that our difference with the author is not unimportant to his argument. We disagree with his metaphysic, and believe that he largely underrates the mystery of human personality, and describes it with a precision which is not legitimately possible to the human mind.

Such a charge may, perhaps, surprise some readers of Mr. Illingworth's lectures, since he repeatedly acknowledges the impossibility of defining personality. It 'cannot be exhaustively analysed, and cannot, therefore, be accurately defined' (p. 23). 'We cannot, strictly speaking, define personality, for the simple reason that we cannot place ourselves outside it' (p. 28).<sup>1</sup> But these, and many other like statements of the mystery, are insufficient so long as it is laid down that 'the fundamental character of personality is self-consciousness, the quality in the subject, of becoming an object to itself, or, in Locke's language, considering itself as itself and saying "I am I."'<sup>2</sup>

The terms in which Mr. Illingworth describes the operation of his 'fundamental characteristic' prove that we are under no misconception when we suppose him to regard our self-consciousness, not as a primary and inscrutable condition of our human life, which, like life itself, ever escapes our understanding, but as a conclusion which our intellect draws in a reflection of somewhat advanced and educated character upon the phenomena which we discover. For, he proceeds, 'as in the very act of becoming thus self-conscious, I discover in myself desires and a will, the quality of self-consciousness immediately involves that of self-determination.' We, for our part, place self-consciousness, and with it personality, at a far earlier stage in human progress. It is discerned wherever the human being says, or even implies, I, with any verb whatever attached to the pronoun. To become self-conscious in Mr.

<sup>1</sup> See also pp. 24, 25, 39, 41, 47, 74, 135, 153.

<sup>2</sup> See pp. 28-9, 31-2, 38-9.

Illingworth's sense of the word, or to discover anything whatever within one's mind, is a reflex mental action which cannot be the fundamental characteristic of self-consciousness because it arises at a later period. We must not deny the self-consciousness or the personality of those millions of human beings who never yet discovered in themselves either desires or a will. To use our faculties is not necessarily to discern them.

The identical proposition 'I am I' amounts to no more than the well-known dictum of the old hermit of Prague, 'that that is, is.' The second I is no more an object than the first. And the real truth is that nothing which constitutes matter of objective knowledge enters into our conception of the Ego in its inmost meaning. We say 'I *have* a body, an intellect, a will, and affections.' We do not say, I *am* intellect, will, or love any more properly than we can say, I am a body, or a brain. An object of thought must have certain known and definite characters which can be presented to the mind. What, then, are the definite characters which the self can present to itself, and say, these are not mere possessions of the self nor powers or instruments in which the self is interested; they are the actual self? Let the reader try the experiment upon himself. Let him essay to make himself the object of his own thought. He can readily think of properties, capacities, and acts which he has called and continues to call his own. But are they himself? are they the Ego within him? The very fact that he calls them his, is evidence that he does not identify them with himself. And he cannot explain the method in which himself is united to them, and claims them as belonging to him, or himself as belonging to them.

Mr. Illingworth concedes that the primary use of the word 'I' is to denote the subject when he says that 'the subject becomes an object.' But if it lets go its subjectivity for the purpose of becoming an object, what is the subject that comes in its place? Or how can the self be at the same moment subjective for the purpose of knowing itself and objective for the purpose of being known? The Ego can never catch itself as an object of knowledge at the moment of its own activity. Kant well says that 'it is the empirical consciousness which informs me that there are in myself perceptions, remembrances, and internal diversity; it is the transcendental consciousness which furnishes me with the idea represented by the word "I," the subject, always the same and identical.'

Do we, therefore, deny that our personality can ever be



known to ourselves? No; but we deny that it can be known objectively except by taking for the Ego that which, however close to it and in common language included in it, is not the real Ego. We are conscious of our personality subjectively, and no otherwise; but subjective knowledge is real though indefinite. I am conscious that I will, that I think, that I act. It is the willing, the thinking, and the acting that really become objects of my understanding. But it is not these acts—it is the primary original power of the I to do them—that constitutes personality. The I which lies behind them hides itself from the understanding. That it does these things we know; but how it does them or what it is we know not. We are much surprised that Mr. Illingworth should write (p. 70), 'When I say, "I think this, I like that, I will do the other," I am considering myself as an object quite as much as this, that, and the other.' This amounts to a claim that he has succeeded in constructing three propositions each of which contains two objects and no subject at all.

The Marquis of Salisbury has said that the ether has been invented merely to furnish a nominative case to the verb undulate. The list of verbs to which the word 'I' furnishes a nominative case is larger; but the amount of objective knowledge which that fact implies regarding the Ego is no larger. The verb to undulate is comprehensible. It is a known fact in nature and the object of observation in many various forms. But of the ether we only know that it undulates. It is the subject of the proposition. If it were entirely unknown we could not lay down the proposition at all. But the knowledge we have of it may be of the vaguest kind—limited, indeed, to the mere fact that we predicate undulation of it, together with the additional circumstance that in order to undulate it must exist as something distinct from abstract undulation. Cardinal Newman, with his admirable acuteness, displays to us the logical account of such an assent:

'It is the predicate of a proposition that must be apprehended. In a proposition one term is predicated of another, the subject is referred to the predicate, and the predicate gives us information about the subject; therefore to apprehend the proposition is to have that information, and to assent to it is to acquiesce in it as true. Therefore, I apprehend a proposition when I apprehend its predicate. The subject itself need not be apprehended *per se* in order to a genuine assent, for it is the very thing which the predicate has to elucidate, and, therefore, by its formal place in the proposition, so far as it is the subject, it is something unknown, something which

the predicate makes known; but the predicate cannot make it known unless it be known itself.<sup>1</sup>

Now all that we can know objectively about the Ego, the self, the personality, is this, that we can predicate an immeasurable multitude of intelligible actions and experiences concerning the subject 'I.' We understand the predicates but not their subject, except so far as the predicates make it known. It is ever the predicates which become the object of our knowledge, never the subject. If Mr. Illingworth desires to lay down a sentence which shall prove that self is an object to self it must not be 'I am I.' 'I know myself' will not do; for 'myself' is a composite phrase implying a self which I own. I must be 'I know I,' the bad grammar of which proposition only corresponds to its false thought. Is it possible that there can be a subject which shall objectively regard its own subjectivity? It is impossible.

Not only do we deny that the Ego can become an object to itself, but we regard it as a proposition full of danger. Physical science has included human nature in the range of its research. In the mighty system of such a writer as Herbert Spencer every fact of man's surroundings and constitution, of his organism and his environment, is included. Nothing that presents itself as a phenomenon—that is to say, as an object to the observation of science—is omitted, either in its origin or in its working. And Mr. Spencer<sup>2</sup> maintains that it is an illusion to suppose that the self at each moment is anything more than the aggregate of feelings and ideas, actual and nascent, which then exists. The universal language of man contradicts him. For what is it that talks of 'my feelings and ideas, actual or nascent,' if there be nothing present but the feelings and ideas themselves? But if the Ego which makes our personality is capable of being made an object, the courts of science are fit to take cognizance of it. We maintain, on the contrary, that the facts accumulated by science are of necessity imperfect as accounts of personality, and unable to present its essential nature to our view. But what justification can we give of our belief except this: that when everything that can be made the object of our thought has been dealt with there still remains something else—namely, our subjectivity—which cannot be objectively thought, yet is the spring of every action both of mind and body? And under its protection free will and conscience find a

<sup>1</sup> *Grammar of Assent*, chap. ii.

<sup>2</sup> *Elements of Psychology*, vol. i. p. 500.

refuge when driven by unanswerable reasoning out of the regions of objective observation and law.

Moreover, the belief that our true self can be objectively regarded is not only the source of scientific imperfection, but of practical mistakes well known to every moralist. It is constantly found that men construct imaginative plans for their future life which are proved by the event to have been quite mistaken. We can make clear, not only to ourselves, but to every observer, by every argument that can be the object of our knowledge, that at some future crisis we shall act so and so. As thus: we shall be sick, we shall be dying, we shall be incapable of pursuing pleasure, we shall have death and judgment brought close to us. What, then, upon consideration of all objective reasons, shall hinder us from being converted? Nothing can do it, speaking objectively. But when the occasion comes up we cannot either act or speak objectively. It is a subjective matter. The Ego has a power which it is not enough to call a veto. It has an initiative, and, if it does not consent, all the arguments that can be brought will not suffice to effect the fulfilment of a prophecy in which we reckoned without the Ego. We must reckon without the Ego when we prophesy, since the Ego does not appear on the stage except at the moment of action. And then, if it will not or cannot give the word, all our plans, imaginations, and even desires, come to nought.

Our attempts then to grasp and understand our personality as an object of thought must be granted liable in any case to great errors. But the truth is, that they are essentially and of necessity impotent. They can present to themselves many objects which in common every-day language we call parts of ourselves. Our bodies are of this class, for when we hurt a limb of our body we say we have hurt ourselves. Yet what spiritual thinker would say that these gross organized bodies, as Butler calls them, are ourselves? Have we any greater right to maintain that in exact and logical, as well as in common every-day language, our minds or any faculties of them constitute our true selves? There is in this respect no difference between the claims of the mind and those of the body. As the one, so also the other, falls away from the true Ego as we go in search of it. They are its instruments, but not itself. If we could be content with an Ego which merely includes the clothing or the operations of the Ego, we can present them as objects before us. But if we have not found the Ego in its subjective attitude, we have not found it at all. And we must admit that it is beyond the power of the human

intellect to perform this feat, except in that vague form which belongs to the subject in propositions. The essential Ego never can be made an object of thought, and never will. Is it, then, in an intellectual act necessarily imperfect that we can find the essential character of personality?

We discern the source of Mr. Illingworth's reflective conception of self-consciousness and personality in a certain exaggeration of the power of thought which appears in Lecture I.:

'A man lives, and as he lives reflects upon his life, with the result that he comes by degrees to understand what is within him: his capacities, his powers, the meaning of his actions. And as he does so he ceases to be the creature of outward circumstances or mere inward instinct; he knows what he is about, and can direct and concentrate his energies; his life becomes fuller, richer, more real, more concrete, because more conscious; his thought is not a mirror which passively reflects his life, but, on the contrary, his life is the image, the picture, the music, the more or less adequate language of his thoughts' (p. 5).

The writer here confuses that secondary sense of the word life in which it means the contents and experiences of life with the primary and simple sense which means the act of living. To be sure, when we speak of a man's life as a thing filling time and space and having large contents, we justly ascribe its character to his thought. But could he have conceived one thought without being alive in order to conceive it? Nothing can properly deprive life of its precedence over thought. In the logical sense we may say with Descartes that we live because we think; that only means that thinking enables us to know that we live. In the order of causes thought follows from life, not life from thought; and it is certain that as a man lives and reflects upon his life he may conceive desires and arrive at conclusions which instead of filling his life shall empty it, instead of developing shall wither it. Human thought has no such invariable tendency to favour true personal existence and work as the simple fact of life which lies underneath it. 'In a sense,' proceeds the lecturer, 'we may say truly that thought realizes or invests things with more complete reality, and so that only what is rational is real.' Thought realizes, but in the plain meaning of that phrase it realizes nothing except that which it is compelled to think of as real before it was thought of. We find it hard to grasp the meaning of the proposition that 'only what is rational is real.' The only sense in which we can understand it is one in which reason shall be taken to mean

the capacity of apprehending reality ; and reason in this sense must renounce all power of creating the reality which it apprehends. It loses its title to be called reason if it entertains such a thought.

There is a large field of investigation which since the time of Darwin has appeared to writers of more than one school to be a necessary preliminary to that concerning the mind of man, but which Mr. Illingworth leaves untouched. We mean the life of the lower creatures, among which we find much that is common to ourselves, both in what is bodily and what is mental, yet from which we withhold the term personality. The question why we do so is well calculated to clear our view upon the real sense of the personality of man. Thus, Mr. Harris is quoted (p. 226) as saying that desire is feeling accompanied with the additional sense of selfhood ; and we do not quarrel with this description of desire in man. But there are an immense multitude of inferior beings in the world to which the general voice ascribes the possession of desires, though not the sense of selfhood. If this customary way of thinking about the brutes be right, what could be imagined more useful for discovering the real meaning of human personality than to mark wherein human desire resembles that of the lower animals, and wherein it differs? Why do we refuse to see in the lower creatures the same desires of which we are conscious? It may well seem that 'the fallacy' to which Professor Green points, 'of taking the pleasure which ensues on satisfaction of a desire to be the object of the desire,' is an error born of the superior 'selfhood' of man, who is capable of separating an abstract thing, pleasure, from the perception of the objects which can produce it, an act of mind which the simpler nature of the brute cannot compass, with the result that its desires are more genuine.

Mr. Illingworth commences his survey of the progress of human opinion upon personality by laying down the broad principle that

'personality, as we understand it, is universal in its extension and scope—that is, it must pertain to every human being as such, making him man ; and it is one in its intention or meaning—that is, it is the unifying principle, or, to use a more guarded expression, the name of the unity in which all a man's attributes and functions meet, making him an individual self' (pp. 6, 7).

For our part we had much rather call personality the unifying principle than the name of the unity in which all a man's attributes and functions meet. We grant that we do use the word as the name of the unity of all a man's attri-

butes, even down to his pettiest habits and his dress—a use so wide that it is obviously too wide. We cannot include so much in any strict definition of his personality. It is the unifying power of the Ego commanding, directing, and welding together the attributes and functions that constitutes the true personality; and the conquest and organization of all the attributes and functions under the central Ego is the problem of life. To state the case thus is to make the unity of the race a much plainer matter than the lecturer makes it, who includes the infinite varieties of attribute and function in the personality.

In accordance with his definition he (p. 7) regards the contempt which the ancients display for certain races and classes, and their failure to co-ordinate human faculties, as a failure to understand what personality is. We rather prefer to describe it as a failure to use personality aright and advance it to its just dominion. In the failure to understand what personality is, the ancients and the moderns, heathen and Christian, are alike, for it cannot be understood. The Christian's advantage lies in the grace and the example which he obtains from his Incarnate Redeemer to reduce the unruly Ego itself to obedience, while by virtue of that very subjection the same Ego is endowed with absolute liberty and the lordship of all things. It is still in the power of any man, possessed though he may be of all the knowledge about personality with which modern and Christian influences have endowed the world, to reduce his personality to the same condition as, or a worse condition than, that in which the heathen lived, by allowing vice to take possession of his body and his mind, and his faculties to pass from beneath his own control.

We suspect that Mr. Illingworth lays too much stress upon introspection as a means of progress in the knowledge of personality. Doubtless the mighty Augustine did vast services in this, as in all other departments of Christian thought. But we attribute this to his intense earnestness of life and his comprehension of the doctrines of grace rather than to any formal results of his inward communing. The 'attempt to sound the abyss of our being,' as Mr. Illingworth puts it, has, perhaps, done the cause of personality nearly as much harm as good, since it has often ignored the mystery which lies in our self, and professed to comprehend the connexion between the Ego and the actions and thoughts which it claims to rule. Forgetfulness of this mystery leads the predestinarian to lay down a system comprehensible to the



intellect by which the operation of Nature or of God upon the self, and of the self upon the actions, is reduced to theory. The New Testament—least introspective of books, but ever mindful of the high nature of the Godhead and of humanity, has done infinitely more than any other book to keep before man the personality of his Maker and of himself in its inscrutable mystery. And we do not believe that the predestinarian doctrine even of St. Augustine deserves the praise of advancing our knowledge of personality.

But far more still do we doubt the justice of naming Luther as one of the few who have rendered supreme service in this great subject of thought and action. Does the author of the *De Servo Arbitrio* help a cause with which free will is so intimately connected? And does the theologian who placed the feeling of confidence in so exaggerated a position in the Christian character contribute pre-eminently to the unifying of the faculties of man? It is true that passages may be found in the writings of Luther which represent God and man as (in Dorner's phrase) 'inwardly connected with each other, and, as it were, yearning for each other in condescending and ascending love.'<sup>1</sup> And it is also true that Luther's human 'personality' was of commanding force and strength; and if we regard that term with Mr. Illingworth as denoting the sum of the human faculties, it must be admitted that few have liberated so great a number of strong personalities as Luther. But if self-will be a disease of personality, and not its character, Luther's work in enabling man to realize it was most imperfect, and he often helped to hinder it. Too many passages in his books have tempted men to make of God a helper of their selfishness, rather than to recognize their supernatural kinship and find their real selves by losing them in Him.

There can be no error in describing Kant as a revealer of light upon the doctrine of human personality. But we hardly think Mr. Illingworth can claim the countenance of Kant. Perhaps that great philosopher resembles St. Paul in the character which the apostle is well known to possess, of enabling teachers of the most various character to claim him for their opinions. We certainly believe Kant to be on our side in the point in which we have ventured to differ from Mr. Illingworth. It is true that in one place Kant says, 'I myself am an object of the internal sense.'<sup>2</sup> But the internal sense is by no means the faculty by which Mr. Illingworth considers

<sup>1</sup> *Person of Christ*, vol. iv. p. 218 (English translation).

<sup>2</sup> *Critique of Pure Reason*, translated by Max Müller, vol. ii. p. 314.

that man becomes an object to himself. The process of self-consciousness, as he has described it, is an exercise, not of the internal sense, but of the intellect.

But let the reader compare the following Kantian passages with the opinion which we maintain of the impossibility of an objective knowledge of the self :

'The concept of personality may remain so long as it is used as transcendental only, that is as a concept of the unity of the subject which is otherwise unknown to us, but in the determinations of which there is an uninterrupted connection by apperception. In this sense such a concept is necessary for practical purposes, and sufficient ; but we can never pride ourselves on it as helping to expand our knowledge of our self by means of pure reason, which only deceives us, if we imagine that we can arrive at an uninterrupted continuance of the subject from the mere concept of the identical self. That concept is only constantly turning round itself in a circle, and does not help us as with respect to any question which aims at synthetical knowledge. . . . When I wish to observe the mere "I" during the change of all representations I have no other correlative for my comparisons, but again the "I" itself, with the general conditions of my consciousness.'<sup>1</sup> . . . 'By the "I," or "he," or "it," the thing that thinks, is expressed nothing but a transcendental subject of thought which is known only through the thoughts which are its predicates, and of which, apart from these, we can have no conception.' . . . 'Hence, when we attempt to think this Ego as an object, we are involved in a vicious circle, for we must always employ the idea of it in order to make any judgment regarding it.'<sup>2</sup> . . . 'The truth therefore is, that of the Ego in itself, apart from its relation to experience, we know nothing ; and that even in experience the Ego appears not as itself an object, but as the logical unity to which a thing must be related ere we can think it as an object.'<sup>3</sup>

'What, then,' asks Lotze,<sup>4</sup> 'am I? Suppose anyone answered thus : "I am subject and object of my thoughts." This would at least require that we should understand what is meant by the possessive pronoun *mine*. For only then can we point to the subject of my thoughts as the I. It is, however, clear that, put together ideas as we will, we cannot define the meaning of this word *mine*. We cannot say, it is that which belongs to the I, for if we do the old difficulty at once recoils upon us, and we are explaining the meaning of the I by the reference to the *mine*. There is, therefore, nothing left for it but to have given us an immediate experience, through which, and not before which, the distinction between what we call mine and what is not mine, and with it the distinction between I and thou, is felt and revealed.'

We do not believe Lotze to be right in contending that

<sup>1</sup> *Critique*, loc. cit. pp. 317, 318.

<sup>2</sup> Caird on Kant, p. 539.

<sup>3</sup> *Ib.* p. 541.

<sup>4</sup> *Philos. of Rel.* by Conybeare, Lond. 1892, p. 66.

in the order of our inward experience the conception of the *mine* comes before that of the *I*. We hold that that *Ego* which includes something that is *mine* must be preceded by, and founded on, a simpler *I*, the mysterious and undefinable possessor implied in the very first use of the word *mine*. But suppose him right in this conception; the original mystery would not be much less conspicuous if it consisted in a transcendental origin of the word *mine* than it is if we acknowledge that *I*, as implied in our very first dim feeling that any thing or any experience is ours, can never be the object, but ever and always the subject, of all that is thought, felt, or done.

Mr. Illingworth adduces a passage from the author last quoted as the key to the whole line of thought which occupies the part of his work which is devoted to the personality of God. 'Perfect personality is in God only; to all finite minds there is allotted only the pale copy thereof; the finiteness of the finite is not a producing condition of this personality, but a limit and hindrance to its development' (p. 53). We are here in full accord both with Mr. Illingworth and with the noble passage which he quotes, but we hardly think him consistent in professing to see in the finiteness of the finite a mere limit and hindrance to the development of personality. He finds the fundamental character of personality in a self-consciousness, which involves self-determination and the power of making our desires an object of our will, and saying 'I will do what I desire'; but how can such a personality be otherwise than essentially finite? This is personality at work with the finite. The lecturer, in order to find the character of personality, launches it into that very whirlpool of desire which, as Lotze more truly maintains, is but the limit and hindrance to its development.

We, on the contrary, find our personality in the subjective sense of our individual existence, which comes to the knowledge of our intellects through its connexion with desire, but still finds that connexion to be a limitation and a subjection rather than a congenial self-expression. It is in the primary and original force of the *Ego*, and not its return upon itself in intellectual self-knowledge, that personality consists.

Therefore, in the great revelation to Moses, the expression of the Divine personality is not 'I am I,' but 'I am.' The simple recognition of the Divine Being in Himself, before any connexion or contrast with the world; without question of any knowledge of Him on the part of men, or even any self-knowledge on His own part, constitutes belief in a personal

God ; and, to be even a pale copy of the personality of God, that of man must not recognize its fundamental character in its connexion with finite things.

Yet the recognition of the original sense of personality given us from a source beyond the world does not by any means deprive us of the use of those proofs either of the Divine personality or of our own which the finite world and our life in it can give, and which Mr. Illingworth states for us so excellently well. The noble condemned to a plebeian life must find even the opportunity for exercising his nobility and for proving its truth, amidst actual circumstances, poor though they be ; and man's intellectual conception of God and of the personality in his own nature which establishes his union with God must be exercised and proved in the struggles of a finite life, though the essence of both is beyond it.

The God-consciousness which it is impossible to uproot from man's nature comes out firstly in the resemblance which we feel between God's relation to the world and our own ; and, secondly, in the sense of weakness and the cry for help which is forced from us in the attempt to maintain our true personal character in the pressure of physical law and force. As to the first : Whatever taunts be launched at anthropomorphism, that frame of things and no other must seem reasonable to us, in contact with which we have been born and brought up, and through which our reason itself has received the bent from which it cannot be freed. And that frame of things is one in which a mysterious personal existence called 'I' holds in a circle of action and thought a place of rightful command ; with instruments spiritual and material to use, with powers which can produce immense effects upon the world of matter and of mind. This is the system of the world as man knows it in his own sphere, and his personal experience. Nothing can be more reasonable to man than the belief that a higher measure of the same relations of spiritual power to physical things is the system of the universe.

To be sure it is possible to construct an account of the mere machinery of things in which no personality above that of man appears. But this cannot surprise us, since it is possible to construct a similar plan of man's own world, in which his own personality shall be unnoticed, and all the world, with man himself included, shall be represented as a vast system of uniform physical law. Yet we know that such a representation is perfectly false to our intimate experience.

It would be impossible to carry it into practice, and if it were practised it would take the humanity out of man, and the living principle out of life. Equally false and equally fatal is it to expel the belief in a personal God from our conception of the universe.

Upon the second point we find that this 'I,' which each of us possesses as the origin of thought and action within him, is sorely in want of help for its life-struggle. The very powers of mind and body which it calls its own, and takes into association as forming part of what it describes as 'I myself,' are rebellious and difficult to rule and are capable of acquiring habits of their own in spite of the Ego, whereby it is often compelled to recognize as its own, acts and habits which make it miserable; and beyond them lies a whole outside world, constantly plotting to enslave the personal power within us. We can obtain some help in the contest from our fellow men. It is sympathy which moves us to call upon them and them to respond to our call; indeed, it is only by sympathy and not by any logical proof that we discover them to be men like ourselves, possessed of personality, instead of being parts of the machinery of the outer world, from which mere reason could never distinguish them. But their help is insufficient, and we hear with delight of a personal God, who, through that mysterious personality of ours, inaccessible to our understanding but open to Him, may pour into our inner self, and through that into all parts of our active life, the grace which we require. The mystery and incompleteness of our personality in the view of our intellects is the very characteristic which fits it to be the channel of our access to God and of His access to us.

Nothing can exceed the truth and beauty of the expansion in Lecture V. of the theme that moral affinity is needful for knowledge of a person. But these admirable reasonings might have rested upon grounds even stronger if personality had been recognized as incapable of furnishing an object to the intellect and therefore impossible to prove or to recognize either in God or man except by the affinity of faith.

Mr. Illingworth admirably urges the benefit rendered to man's practical use of his personality by the doctrines of the Incarnation and the Holy Trinity. Yet he wisely and carefully guards himself against the charge which is so readily made against these revelations, that they are human developments made at the suggestion of their usefulness to man. The lecturer shows with perfect clearness that it was under the teaching of the facts of Christian history, and through the

necessity which arose in controversy to keep the meaning of the original revelation unimpaired, that the doctrines of the Creeds were developed.

We are strongly of opinion that his view of the effect of Catholic doctrine upon the sense and the power of man's personality is greatly weakened by his determination to find the human analogue (if such a phrase be permitted) to the personalities of the Holy Trinity, not in human personalities according to the general application of that term, but in the trinity of essential action within the individual.

'If we recur,' he writes, 'to our previous analysis of human personality we shall see that it is essentially triune, not because its chief functions are three—thought, desire, and will—for they might, perhaps, be conceivably more, but because it consists of a subject, an object, and their relation. A person is, as we have seen, a subject who can become an object to himself, and the relations of these two terms is necessarily a third term.'

That any such analogy had to do with the development of the doctrine of the triune Personality of God we cannot believe. In the first place it would seem to us plainly to point, not to a threefold personality of God, but a threefold movement within one personality. For why should that which in us is the inevitable action of one personality within itself become a threefold personality in God?

We by no means deny that in contemplating the Unity of God we are at liberty, nay, are forced to regard It under the analogy of a single human personality. 'The question,' says Cardinal Newman,<sup>1</sup> 'has almost been admitted by St. Austin, whether it is not possible to say that God is *One* Person, for He is wholly and entirely Father, and at the same time wholly and entirely Son, and wholly and entirely Holy Ghost.' It is in this point of view, we believe, that St. Augustine is writing in the passage which Mr. Illingworth quotes as one of those which form an era in the exposition of the Trinity and are its best exponent. 'I exist, and I am conscious that I exist, and I love the existence and the consciousness; and all this independently of any external influence.' And again, 'I exist, I am conscious, I will, I exist as conscious and willing, I am conscious of existing and willing, I will to exist and to be conscious; and these three functions, though distinct, are inseparable, and form one life, one mind, one essence.'

It is impossible to contend that St. Augustine's analysis

<sup>1</sup> *St. Athanasius*, ii. 321, ed. 1881.



of human nature into existence, consciousness, and will corresponds to Mr. Illingworth's into subject, object, and relation. At all events, the Saint plainly professes to give us an analysis of the working of a single human personality; humbly intimating, with a deep sense of the mystery of the matter, that he can dimly understand how a triple movement might similarly have place within the Unity of God. And although it could not be maintained that the distinction of existence, self-consciousness, and will form a sufficient basis for ascribing distinct personality to each of the corresponding movements in the Divine Nature, yet they are far more plainly connected with the functions ascribed to the persons of the Holy Trinity than the lecturer's more subtle and recondite psychology. For Existence finds itself in the Father, the Fount of Being, Will in the Son, by Whom and through Whom all things were made, and Consciousness in the Holy Ghost, who knoweth the things of God as the spirit of man that is in him knows the things of a man. But what possibility of distinct personality can we find in subject, object, and relation?

The chief New Testament passage in which the analysis of the individual mind might seem to be regarded as furnishing an analogy to the Personalities of the Holy Trinity is the teaching concerning the Logos in the beginning of St. John's Gospel. But we must beg Mr. Illingworth to remember that commentators are not agreed to regard the Logos of St. John as 'the Philonian Logos.' Bishop Westcott and Godet among the most recent, contend that we are to find in St. John not the Hellenistic but the Palestinian meaning of the Logos—not the Reason but the simple Uttered Word, the Will of God revealed and made manifest.<sup>1</sup> And when we think of the Apocalyptic Warrior whose name is called the Word of God, this opinion seems surely the more probable. The New Testament, as we read it, did not bequeath to the Church any example of psychological meditation as an instrument for representing to ourselves the reflection of the Divine Personality resting on the life of man. It rejects such a method by the very use of the terms Father and Son, so constantly adopted in the sacred writings, and so faithfully received by the Church as the proper words, with all their human associations, to express what man can know of the first two Persons of the Holy Trinity. These designations plainly show that it is the difference and the union of separate human persons

<sup>1</sup> *Introduction to St. John, Speaker's Comment.* pp. xv-xvii; Godet, *Évangile de St. Jean*, vol. i. p. 40 sq., p. 110 sq.

which point us upwards to like distinctions in the Godhead, and enable us to realise, as well as we are now capable of doing, the mutual relation of Persons in His Infinite Being. It is certain that now, when the immemorial use of words such as father and son, expressing outward relations among men, to convey revealed conceptions of God, has been reinforced by the equally universal application of the term person to distinct human beings, men will never find anywhere but in their personal separations and personal bonds as individuals the assistance which they can derive from earth for grasping the mysteries of heaven.

Mr. Illingworth is too reasonable and well informed to deny the appearance of the analogy of outward human relations in the primitive teaching concerning the persons of the Godhead. But he allows it grudgingly in the following terms :

But, as a matter of fact, the Christian Church did not press the family analogy, at any rate further than the doctrine of the Son. It probably saw early exhibited among the Gnostic sects the dangerous practical consequences which might ensue from the introduction of a feminine principle into our thoughts about the Godhead ; and therefore, while freely admitting feminine attributes, declined all thought of a feminine hypostasis, though possibly this may have involved some under-estimate of an aspect of truth, which avenged itself in the subsequent development of Mariolatry. It is, therefore, under the more fundamental psychological analogy that we find the doctrine of the Trinity slowly defined, with the natural consequence that the conception of the Word is completed sooner than that of the Spirit, since a personal object is easier to imagine than a personal relation.<sup>1</sup>

We must confess to finding in this passage an astounding representation of the evolution of the Christian Creed. Surely the revelation in Christ was not so ambiguous in its nature as ever to leave the Church free to press the analogy of the family and stop short of adding a feminine element to the Divine Being only because Gnosticism afforded a warning of the danger. And if it was under the psychological analogy that the doctrine of the Trinity was slowly defined, the records which have remained of any such process are indeed scanty.

But Mr. Illingworth is not correct in assuming that the family analogy necessarily means the comparison of the Godhead to the human group of husband, wife, and child. This analogy has led, perhaps, to the evolution of the human trinity of Jesus, Mary, and Joseph—human because it is only

<sup>1</sup> Pp. 72, 73.

in His human nature that the Son can form a part of it. Nor was even that attempted until the idea of womanhood had been sublimated above nature by many centuries of chivalry and devotion. The triads of which Mr. Illingworth speaks as existing in other religions belong to periods of naturalism, and no form of pure Christianity could ever attempt to repeat them in Christian theology. The woman to the Oriental mind is wholly subordinate to the man, bone of his bone and flesh of his flesh, and unfit to claim a personality on a par with him.

It seems to us that the earthly three to which the adorable Trinity of heaven may be humbly compared is not husband, wife, and child, but father, brother, and self. Husband, wife, and child do not form a complete specimen of human society as it presents itself to the opening view of the man's mind and soul; for there is nothing in them corresponding to the immense multitude of brethren who exist in the world, not above him as the father (with the mother comprehended in him) is, but beside him and on a level with himself. But father, brother, and self give the personality above him, the personality beside him, and the personality within him, and these, varied in an infinity of forms and circumstances, make up the human society. Every help that comes to him is either from someone above him or someone beside him; every duty that he owes is either to one above or one beside; and the self within him unites him with a mysterious power both to the fathers and to the brethren. For they are persons like himself, and sympathy binds them all in one.

The wants, defects, and failures of this union of human personalities which makes up society is so great in the midst of its innumerable blessings and benefits that it yearns for help and completion from God. And this the Christian Trinity bestows with immeasurable bounty. Whatever care and instruction comes to the child from his earthly father and those other human friends above him, of whom his father is representative, is multiplied into infinity in God the Father, demanding a corresponding duty and service. Whatever help and example his brethren beside him render is carried out to perfection by the Incarnate Son of God, the Saviour of mankind. And all the activities of the self within, all the powers of sympathy and union which it possesses to bind the persons of the world together (so that, as St. Basil says,<sup>2</sup> all men are of one substance) is completed in the work of the Spirit.

<sup>2</sup> *Ad. Eun.* ii. 4.

This is the view whereby, in our judgment, we find the human notions of personality displayed by the Catholic doctrine in a heavenly perfection. And thus may man, with the revealed aids which the Christian creed affords to him, succeed in reducing his own faculties and the powers of the world to subjection, so that personality shall shine out in triumph as the ruling principle of nature. But we can by no means perceive how the inward psychological relations of the Divine Personality to itself can be brought to bear with equal closeness upon life.

Our differences, then, with Mr. Illingworth are very considerable. We have not concealed them, and we cannot deny that the primary error which he makes as to the essential nature of personality does much to spoil our concurrence and our enjoyment in the perusal of large portions of his work. We must count it a great defect that the transcendental, or, if we choose to call it so, the supernatural, basis of our personal consciousness should be lost to view, and the essential character of the person be found in an intellectual process which has no more of the supernatural in it than any other act of the mind.

But the mysterious and transcendental nature of our personality tends of itself to make it possible that even where this secret thing is left out of view there should remain enough among its experienced and intelligible consequences to furnish a rich and interesting work. The lesson which is given us from above in the region of our spirit may be regarded, like the power of its Divine Giver, as operating in the tangible world and having a bearing upon every act of life. And of the life of argument and experience, of the history of man's personal thinking and working, of the every-day practical use of his self-consciousness, Mr. Illingworth writes with unflagging power. He has produced a work not unworthy of his own high reputation and of the honourable series in which it holds a place.

#### SHORT NOTICES.

*The Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint.* By H. B. SWETE, D.D. Vol. iii. Hosea—4 Maccabees. (Cambridge: University Press, 1894.)

THIS volume concludes the smaller edition of the Cambridge Septuagint, which the editor has had in hand since 1883. We may be allowed to congratulate Dr. Swete on finishing a task which has involved so much labour and careful work. This will be, for a long

time at any rate, the standard edition for purposes of reference; nor is it likely to be displaced when we have in our hands the larger Cambridge edition, for the preparation of which steps have already, we believe, been taken. This must, however, require a long time to complete, and even when it is complete it is not likely very much to alter the text of the Septuagint, though it will, of course, add very many *variae lectiones* from the cursive manuscripts, versions, and patristic quotations.

The volume before us begins with the minor and major prophets, the text of Daniel being given, on parallel pages, according to the versions of the Septuagint and Theodotion. This last, as is well known, is the one generally found in MSS. of the Septuagint, the other being known only from a comparatively late cursive, belonging to the Chigi collection. The text of Theodotion's version is based, in the main, on four uncial manuscripts. It should be added that the readings of the Syrohexaplar version, based on a specially made collation of Ceriani's *Codex Syro-hexaplaris Ambrosianus*, are given here beneath the Septuagint version of this book. For the text of the prophets several new manuscripts have been employed. Thus we have the readings of the *Codex Marchalianus*, a famous hexaplaric manuscript, from which all the variants are given, as well as the hexaplaric notes and symbols. The second new manuscript is a palimpsest from the Basilian monastery of Grotta Ferrata, the readings of which have been, where possible, recovered by Cozza; but, owing to the fact that in some places the underlying uncial writing has had two scribes at work over it, there are many places where it cannot be recovered. Besides this, the readings of three sets of fragments are given, two of which come from Isaiah, while the third is a small portion of Bel and the Dragon, which the Bodleian Library acquired from Egypt in 1888.

After the Prophets we have the four Books of the Maccabees. The text of these books is given from A (*Codex Alexandrinus*), B (*Codex Vaticanus*) not containing them. We have also the readings of S (*Codex Sinaiticus*), so far as it is available, and of a manuscript not used before—*Codex Venetus*—which is the same as 23 of Holmes and Parsons (who wrongly regarded and numbered it as a cursive), and is denoted as V. Of the readings of this manuscript a collation was specially made for this volume. Dr. Swete has also printed here the *Psalms of Solomon*—a work of which we rather doubt the claims for a place in the Greek Old Testament—and the Canticles, including those of the New Testament. For the Psalms of Solomon a new MS. has been collated and used, the readings of five other manuscripts being supplied by Professor Ryle and Dr. M. R. James, whose edition of this work is well known.

It is but fair to add here, from Dr. Swete's concluding remarks in his preface, that the appearance of the work so soon is due to the timely and patient assistance of Mr. Forbes Robinson, of Christ's College, and Mr. Thackeray, of King's College, who have done a great deal of the collation necessary for this volume. The accuracy of the text has been also no doubt increased—for many sets of eyes

VOL. XL.—NO. LXXIX.

P

are an advantage in such minute work as this—by the revision for which we are indebted to Mr. Redpath and Dr. Nestle. One further point in connexion with the volume before us should be added, and it is this, that Dr. Nestle has collated afresh the readings of B from the published photograph of that MS., and also of A, where its text had to be adopted owing to gaps in B, as in Gen. i. 1—xlvi. 28. Thus we may feel sure that we have now the greatest possible exactness in regard to the main text of these three volumes.

We will confess that we have regarded it as lost labour to examine this volume in search of misprints, for in this respect our examination of the two preceding volumes was so unfruitful in result that we are willing to go bail for the excellency of the third. We will conclude, as we began, with a word of congratulation and thanks to all concerned for putting within the reach of scholars such a trustworthy and well-printed edition of the Septuagint. This work can never lose its interest, and we are glad to think that with such a text of it as the one under notice, and such a Concordance as that on which Mr. Redpath is engaged, it ought not to be long before we get some work which shall investigate thoroughly the lexical and grammatical peculiarities of the Greek of the Septuagint. We are glad, in this connexion, to hear a rumour of a possible new edition of Schleusner's Lexicon. We notice also the announcement of a book by Dr. Swete, which we hope may not be long delayed, viz. an *Introduction to the Septuagint*, which cannot fail to be very interesting and very useful.

*A Concordance to the Septuagint and the other Greek Versions of the Old Testament.* By the late EDWIN HATCH, D.D., and HENRY A. REDPATH, M.A. Part iv. *κάβος . . . μυρεψικός*. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1895.)

THE fourth part of this excellent work does not call for any special notice. There is little to be said about it except that it keeps up, so far as we have tested it, the remarkable level of accuracy and exactness which the first three parts have shown. The enormous amount of labour involved may be indicated by a reference to the word *κύριος*. The quotations of passages in which this word is found cover nearly forty pages, each of which gives some two hundred references to the word with the Hebrew equivalent. We have compared some few pages with Schleusner's lexicon, and the result is to show in this Concordance a large number of words not in Schleusner, and at the same time a very much greater accuracy in the references. The last fact is partly explained, no doubt, by a difference in the editions used. We have noticed, by the comparison above mentioned, that Theodotion is quoted by Schleusner for *κάρπωμα* at Josh. v. 12, *καρνίσκος* is found occurring at Exod. xxxvii. 20, and 1 Kings xvii. 51 is quoted for *κολέος* or *κολαιός*. Of these the last (which is read in A) is the only omission, for there are good reasons why Mr. Redpath might have omitted the first two references. We do not see why Mr. Redpath says *κατάγεν*, cf. *καταγίνειν*, and *vice versa*. As instances of words in this part which are interesting from the point of view of the New



Testament uses might be mentioned *κεφαλαῖω, κεφάλαιον, μακροθυμῆν, κύριος, λόγος, and καρδία*. Again, there are many words which have an interest lexically. We might, as instances of these, quote *κάρος* (and its derivatives) and *κραδαίνω*, the latter one of the many interesting parallels between Hellenistic Greek and Homer. Many *ἀπαξ εἰρημένα*, too, will be found; some, of course, mere transliteration of the Hebrew, as *κάβος*; others, as *καροῦχα* (for which Liddell and Scott only quote Polycarp), which raise harder questions. In this last case the same root apparently is found both in Latin and Greek. Those who care for hard problems as to the way in which the Septuagint translation is related to the Hebrew may turn to the word *καρπός*, and the renderings of Ps. iv. 7, Prov. xix. 22, Hos. x. 12, Jer. l. 27. Personally, we can hardly believe that this word can be a *translation*, in any passage, of the Hebrew *יָד* (a hand), as Mr. Redpath seems to consider it in Prov. xxxi. 20. It certainly is the equivalent which the Greek translators gave, but probably only as a sense-translation. But we only wish to point out here how this excellent Concordance may be used by students as a guide in working out a number of interesting and important questions, and to express the hope that we shall soon have it complete. We may remind our readers that those who wish to secure it at the (necessarily high) subscription price of four guineas for the whole work must send in their names before the issue of the next part.

*Analytical Concordance to the Bible.* By ROBERT YOUNG, D.D. Sixth edition, revised throughout; to which is added an important Supplement entitled 'A Sketch of Recent Explorations in Bible Lands,' by Rev. THOMAS NICOL, D.D. (Edinburgh: George Adam Young and Co., s.a.)

It is many years ago since we called attention in the pages of this Review<sup>1</sup> to the first edition of this most admirable Concordance to the English Bible. We then explained the plan of the work, and, as it has never left our side since we first noticed it, we are prepared to testify to the excellence of that plan. The sixth revised edition has recently reached us, and for some inexplicable reason no date is affixed to the issue. We see no reason to retract or qualify the encomiums we then passed on the work, except, now as then, as regards the regrettable omission of the Apocryphal books, an omission which detracts so largely from the usefulness of the publication. At the end of the Concordance we find Dr. Nicol's 'Sketch of Recent Explorations in Bible Lands,' which is sufficiently up to date to include, for example, the discovery of the Tel-el-Amarna tablets. This occupies sixteen quarto double-column pages, and is divided into twenty chapters. Then follow, with a separate pagination, a series of appendices, which compress into the small space of 141 closely printed pages a vast amount of valuable information. First we have Hebrew-English and Greek-English lexicons, exhibiting all the varied renderings of each word in the English version,

<sup>1</sup> See *Church Quarterly Review* for October 1879, vol. ix. p. 255.

with the number of their occurrences ; with a romanized index, by which is meant an index giving in English characters the transliteration of each Hebrew and Greek word in the lexicons. Then comes a treatise on the idiomatic use of the Hebrew tenses, followed (1) by copious analytical surveys of the books, the facts, and the idioms of the Bible, and (2) by twenty-five facsimiles of ancient Biblical manuscripts in Hebrew, Samaritan, Syriac, and Greek ; twenty-three engravings, views of the Holy Land ; sixteen coloured maps and plans of Bible lands and places. To incorporate a concordance to the Apocrypha in the body of the work would probably involve an outlay from which the publishers would shrink. But we venture to suggest that room might perhaps be found for it by omitting the analytical surveys just mentioned, the facsimiles of MSS., and the views of the Holy Land, leaving only the maps and plans. With this substitution it would be incomparably the most valuable of all existing concordances to the English Bible.

*A History of the Christian Church during the First Six Centuries.*

By S. CHEETHAM, D.D., F.S.A., Archdeacon and Canon of Rochester ; Honorary Fellow of Christ's College, Cambridge ; Fellow and Emeritus Professor of King's College, London. (London and New York : Macmillan and Co., 1894.)

AN accurate and compendious sketch of the history of the Church in the first six centuries has long been greatly needed. The diffuseness of existing histories has prevented tutors from recommending them to ordination candidates who have been pressed for time, and the historical subjects of such candidates have generally, in the last resort, been studied from the manuscript notes of their tutors. The want of a good book on the period from the foundation of the Church to the Council of Constantinople has been more especially felt. That it has been long in coming is due probably to the great difficulties of compressing so much material into a convenient compass, of deciding how to adjust the claims of chronology and of comprehensive representation of subjects, and of determining how far allusions to original documents and other modern writers could be made really useful. Dr. Cheetham has been singularly successful in coping with these formidable difficulties. Rather too much printed matter is crowded into each page to be quite pleasant for the reader's eye ; but, so far as the treatment of subjects goes, the author has written a much-condensed narrative without crushing out the life and attraction of his story. He has wisely allowed himself to follow out the courses of dogmatic conflicts and growing institutions, to the neglect for the time of contemporary events, and has balanced the danger to which this plan might expose a young student by giving a chronological table, by means of which an idea of the general state of the Church at any epoch may be gained. The sketch rests throughout on original authorities, references being given both to these and to numerous modern works in the notes at the foot of each page.

Of the two parts into which Dr. Cheetham divides his history, the first covers the period from the origin of Christianity to the edict of

Milan in 313. A good map is given, which shows the geographical extent of the Church at the end of this period, and the chief points of the first three centuries are clearly brought out. But we are greatly mistaken if Dr. Cheetham has not allowed this earlier part of his work to stand as he had prepared it for the press a long time ago. We cannot otherwise explain how it is that he makes no allusion to Dr. Lightfoot's great edition of the Ignatian letters in the note on p. 64. This note does not seem to have been touched since 1876; for Dr. Cheetham says, 'The latest and best edition is that by Theod. Zahn,' which was published in that year. We are surprised again, in the note on p. 80 on the composition of the early Roman Church, to find no reference to Dr. Gifford's valuable notes and introduction to the Epistle to the Romans. In the list of modern authorities given in the note on p. 96 on Gnosticism we doubt the wisdom of omitting a reference to the very useful chapter in Robertson.<sup>1</sup> The opposition of the ante-Nicene heretics was so serious a peril to the Church because her canon and her creeds were not yet cast into a defensive form, and the two chapters on 'The Great Divisions' of the period (pp. 86-107) and 'The Theology of the Church and its Opponents' (pp. 108-123) enable us to see how great this peril was. The closing chapter of the first part, on the social life and ceremonies of the Church, is a remarkable collection of facts which have been brought together with much patient industry. The second part starts from the Edict of Milan in 313, and ends with the accession of Pope Gregory the Great in 590. We cannot deny that this is a suitable stopping-place, although it may seem a tantalizing boundary to an English Churchman, when he remembers what Gregory was to do for the Angles. With the arrival of peace with the Empire the Church was able to organize the vast dioceses of the conciliar period, and Dr. Cheetham furnishes us with another excellent map on which the dioceses are clearly marked, and also (p. 181) gives a lucid account of their extent and of the jurisdiction of the great Patriarchates. The chapter on the 'Controversies of the Faith' (p. 252) gives a succinct account of the heresies of the fourth and fifth centuries, although there are a few phrases on Nestorius and Cyril on p. 290 which leave something to be desired. We cannot think that the unhappy 'Nestorius by no means intended to make two persons in Christ,' and the full explanations which St. Cyril gave of his own language—explanations rendered necessary by his own most unfortunate impetuosity—would prevent us from describing even 'the Cyrillic extreme' by a phrase which speaks of 'God taking man's physical frame upon Him rather than man's nature.' Dr. Cheetham, in fact, places Nestorius and Cyril rather more on a level, as being both about equal sufferers from the deductions made from their own well-intended propositions, than the facts would appear to warrant (pp. 285-291). The paragraph and the note on the Photinians (p. 266) would have been greatly strengthened by a reference to one of Bishop Pearson's most learned notes.<sup>2</sup> The

<sup>1</sup> *History of the Christian Church*, bk. i. chap. iv.

<sup>2</sup> *On the Creed*, p. 186 (ed. Bohn).

account of Pelagianism is carefully written (p. 314), with a just estimate of the dangerous tendencies of 'the decidedly predestinarian views' of some later treatises of St. Augustine (p. 320), and a brief allusion is made to the spread of the heresy in Britain (p. 433). The chapter on the discipline of the Church (p. 328) discusses the subject of Monachism, and the very full treatment of the rites, ceremonies, festivals, pictures, and architecture of the Church up to the close of the second period is exceedingly interesting (p. 369). Dr. Cheetham says (p. 398), when speaking of Good Friday, 'On this day there was no Eucharist'—a somewhat too trenchant statement in view of the evidence adducible from St. Chrysostom and other Fathers.<sup>1</sup> With the conversion of the Teutons (p. 418) and the work of the British Church (p. 431) Dr. Cheetham concludes his volume, ending so suddenly that we would fain hope that he intends to give us another volume in which he will carry us further along in the same instructive manner.

*A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Rochester, October 29, 30, 31, 1894.* By RANDALL T. DAVIDSON, D.D., ninety-ninth Bishop. (London: Macmillan and Co., 1894).

CHURCHMEN of all schools of thought will sympathize with the Bishop of Rochester in the illness which has interrupted his active work and in his thought about it that we must not

'regard it as all loss if there come at times to any who are called to responsible authority and leadership in the Church of God an enforced withdrawal from the distracting clang and clatter of our working days—a period when the splashing rapids are exchanged for the deep quiet pool, wherein, even if the pool be dark and overshadowed, reflection is inevitable and has its proper home' (p. 2).

His Charge is in three divisions, the first chiefly about matters connected with his own diocese, the second on the English Church and the clergy generally, the third on 'what goes on within our church walls' (p. 56). Even in the first division there is a good deal the importance of which is not confined to the Diocese of Rochester, and we have noticed with interest the Bishop's 'vision' of a future 'one great coherent diocese' of 'London,' 'with such subordination of episcopal offices as shall best meet its unique and overwhelming needs' (p. 5); his appeal that Church schools may be brought to the highest educational and structural and sanitary efficiency, coupled with his opinion that he would himself 'in like conditions have done precisely what the 'Education 'Department' (p. 14) has done in the matter of school buildings; his answer to those who are delaying to give financial support to the funds for which he appeals on the ground that if 'rate-aid'<sup>2</sup> is 'ere long' 'forthcoming for our voluntary schools,' 'then all these donations for new buildings and the rest will' have

<sup>1</sup> See *Good Friday and Easter Communion, from the days of the Apostles to the Present Time.* By W. A. Frost, Vicar-Choral of St. Paul's Cathedral.

<sup>2</sup> It will be remembered that this Charge was delivered before the Report of the Archbishops' Committee was issued.

been 'wasted' (p. 14) ; and his comments on the 'recovered beauty' of the 'walls' of Rochester Cathedral and the 'great work of restoration and reconstruction in St. Saviour's, Southwark' (pp. 26-7).

The second division of the Charge is a consideration of 'some of our peculiar responsibilities as clergy and lay officers of the National Church' (p. 29). While protesting against the language in which Disestablishment is sometimes denounced as an 'apostasy' or a 'sin,' the Bishop is strongly of opinion that

'it would be a deed of almost incredible folly and shortsightedness, a deed the consequences of which, though unforeseen and unintended by its authors, would be in the highest degree prejudicial to religion, and therefore to the public good, a deed which we are bound as Christians and Englishmen to oppose to the uttermost, and, God helping us, to avert from the land we love' (p. 32).

Similarly, with regard to Disendowment, he repudiates such phrases as 'sacrilege' or 'robbery of God,' while he thinks that the 'nation' has 'a moral right to deal with or (in the original and colourless sense of the word) to "confiscate" the endowments of the Church' only 'upon clear evidence that the endowments' are 'being wasted or misapplied' (pp. 33, 35). In the case of Wales his position is that

'were the Church to miss or to misuse the opportunity she has now begun to occupy afresh ; were she, a generation hence, to have failed to win again on Welsh hill-sides the hearts of an enthusiastic people once her own ; were these counties still to be sending to Westminster an almost solid phalanx hostile to the National Church ; then . . . it might be time to recast, for the sake of all, the conditions of the Church's privilege, and to reconsider her relation to the national life' (p. 37) ;

but that this time has not yet come.

Passing on to other subjects, the Bishop warns his clergy,

'in all earnestness, of the peril of damaging their real usefulness by overtaxing their physical strength in the daily and nightly work within their parishes ;

and that,

'do what we will, the day has twenty-four hours only, and prayer and thought and systematic study—yes, and sufficient sleep and exercise, must all find place' (p. 42).

They are to use, in the consideration of the problems of the day, what they learnt 'at school and college' 'of the life and literature of other days and lands than ours' (p. 44) and their 'unique knowledge of English home life' (p. 45). And it is added—

'The Bishop, Priest, or Deacon who thinks he can define in any trade, or group of trades, the limits of a "living wage," and prescribe the mode of its enforcement, must be venturesome indeed, but the Christian man belies his creed who fails to recognize the law of Christ as laying an absolute obligation upon us all to accept our responsibility for the lives of others, and to see that, if we can help it, no family in Christian England shall live, perforce, in such a home as must degrade and stunt the life' (p. 51).

In the third address we may call attention to the emphasis on the need of open churches as an 'opportunity for quiet' (p. 58), which people are to be taught to use, of 'exegetical' sermons (p. 60), and consequently of the study of Holy Scripture by the clergy. The Bishop looks forward to a time when 'the "Eastward Position," the administration of the Mixed Chalice, the singing of the anthem "O Lamb of God," and the use of the two Lights at the time of Holy Communion' (p. 68) may have ceased to be associated with the holding of any particular doctrine; he regards 'the Reformation' as 'perhaps' 'the greatest fact in English history' 'since the introduction of Christianity to our island' (p. 71); he deplores 'the extent' to which the practice of Confession is 'now prevalent' 'in certain parishes, congregations, and communities' (p. 72) and the 'increase' of 'non-communicating attendance' (p. 73); and he apparently regards the Report of the Committee of the Upper House of the Convocation of Canterbury on the fasting reception of the Holy Communion as entirely satisfactory.

We do not agree with all the Bishop of Rochester says, but we respectfully appreciate the high moral tone which pervades his Charge and the earnest administration of his diocese which the Charge indicates.

*The Eucharistic Offering.* Spiritual Instructions upon the Office of Holy Communion, together with Helps for the carrying out of the same. By G. H. S. WALPOLE, M.A., Professor of Dogmatic Theology, Gen. Theo. Sem., New York; some time Tutor Can. Scho., Truro. With Preface by MORGAN DIX, D.D., D.C.L., Rector of Trinity Church, New York. (London: Skeffington and Son, 1894.)

The same. Second Thousand. (London, 1895.)

THIS manual contains much useful matter. There is a calendar, printed with fair-sized spaces for manuscript additions, in which it is suggested that entries should be made of 'the names of the saints and heroes of the Jewish or Christian Church who are not already mentioned'; of the 'departed or living who are connected with' the user of the book 'by personal ties of natural or spiritual kinship'; of 'great events'; of 'Diocesan, Parochial, or Missionary events'; of 'rulers,' 'scholars,' 'artists,' 'musicians,' those who have given 'counsel, words, and prayers'; of 'personal mercies,' 'Birth, Baptism, Confirmation, First Communion, Marriage, Ordination, &c., &c.' This is followed by instructions on the Eucharist and on the structure of the Eucharistic Service; instructions, questions, and devotions for self-examination; a large number of prayers for use in connexion with the service; forms of preparation and thanksgiving for Communion; a selection of Eucharistic hymns; a number of intercessions; an office of spiritual Communion; a short instruction on Meditation; a table of the chief thoughts of the Collects, Epistles, and Gospels, with suggestions for special acts of praise at the recitation of the Proper Prefaces and for meditations at the different seasons.



The most noticeable feature of the book is an arrangement of the Eucharistic Service after the plan of the Tabernacle, in which the part from the Lord's Prayer to the end of the prayer for the Church Militant is compared with the worship offered in the outer court, from the exhortations to the end of the *Sanctus* with that in the Holy Place, from the prayer of humble access to the blessing with that in the Holy of Holies. The devotions throughout are made to be in harmony with this arrangement.

There is an interesting preface by Professor Walpole, and a prefatory note, called a 'preface' on the title page and 'introduction' in the work itself, by the well-known American Churchman Dr. Morgan Dix. The former comments on the slow growth in the realization of the sacrificial aspect of the Eucharist; the latter suggests some useful thoughts on Eucharistic devotion and life, among which he wisely observes—

'Two things equally undermine the Christian character—a dry formalism and an unreasoning emotionalism. He whose religion is reduced to the observance of forms and ceremonies through which no spiritual force flows in upon his soul is but feeding on ashes; while he whose spiritual life consists in pious enthusiasm unsustained by dogmatic faith may find himself adrift on seas of speculation, when the effect of the stimulus has passed off' (Introduction, p. vii).

We have been puzzled by a point in the arrangement of the Eucharistic prayers. In the plan on p. 17, the order given is 'The Prayer of Consecration,' 'The Gift of the Body and Blood of Christ,' 'The Prayer of Oblation,' 'The Lord's Prayer,' 'The Prayer of Thanksgiving.' This order, which is followed on pp. 36-40, does not correspond with that either of the American or of the English Prayer Book. In the American Book the Oblation is closely connected with the Consecration, and precedes the Communion both of the Priest and of the people. In the English Book the Oblation, as an alternative to the Thanksgiving, follows the Lord's Prayer. We notice that on p. 115 Professor Walpole inserts on the pages generally though not invariably devoted to the public office a prayer of Oblation for private use after the Prayer of Consecration, but a supposition that this is referred to would not solve our difficulty, because it is placed before Communion. In other respects the Service printed and annotated is that of the English Book of Common Prayer, and the manual is evidently intended for English use.

Books of this kind are not without their dangers. An elaborate scheme of private devotion in connexion with the Eucharist may easily lead to confusion of thought and unreality. The copious provision of forms of prayer and thanksgiving may sometimes hinder instead of promoting the personal converse of the soul with God. But for those who will use it wisely as a supplement to the Church's office and a help to their own acts of worship and devotion this manual may be of great use. It is certainly one of which the clergy should know, and which lay persons who are seeking a new book of the kind should examine. Its usefulness might, we think, be increased if a number of blank pages were bound with it at the

beginning and at the end. One of the copies which have been sent to us has wide margins with room for marginal notes ; the other is of smaller size.

*Daily Footsteps in the Church's Path.* Compiled by E. L. B. C. and M. B. With a Preface by the Rev. THOMAS B. DOVER, M.A., Vicar of Old Malden, Surrey. (London : Rivington, Percival, and Co., 1895.)

THIS little volume consists of two extracts—one from a prose writer, the other from a poet—for each day in the Christian year. The compilers mention in a note at the beginning of the book that their aim

‘has been to follow out as far as possible the special teaching of the Church for each Sunday and Holy Day throughout the year, and to make the Collect, Epistle, or Gospel for each Sunday the text for the whole week.’

The extracts are selected from the most various sources, and include passages from, amongst other writers, St. Chrysostom and St. Augustine ; Shakespeare and Sir Thomas Browne ; E. B. Pusey, J. H. Newman, Isaac Williams, John Keble ; C. Kingsley and F. D. Maurice ; Bishop Wilson, Bishop Westcott, Bishop Boyd Carpenter, Bishop Walsham How ; James Hinton and John Ruskin ; Père Grou and George Porter, S. J. ; Christina Rossetti and E. B. Browning ; J. C. Shairp and C. G. Spitta. The work, if it is not used to the neglect of Holy Scripture, will be useful to those who are helped by short passages on which they can quietly think or which they may read in odd moments. As specimens of its contents we may quote the extracts assigned to the Saturday in Easter week and the following Saturday.

‘The devout women asked, “Who shall roll away the stone?” It ought to be, Who *can* roll away the stone?—and they found it rolled away. Often we ask, How can this be done? and often, if we do not give up, if we do what we can, and pray God to supply what is wanting, we find that it is done—the stone is rolled away.

‘GEORGE PORTER, S.J.

‘I know not what may soon betide,  
Or how my wants may be supplied ;  
But Jesus knows, and will provide ;

‘Though sin would fill me with distress,  
The Throne of Grace I dare address,  
For Jesus is my righteousness.

‘Against me earth and hell combine,  
But on my side is power Divine ;  
Jesus is all, and He is mine !

‘JOHN NEWTON, 1779’ (p. 160).

‘The days of this life are short and evil, full of sorrow and straitnesses. O merciful Jesu, when shall I stand to behold Thee? When shall I contemplate the glory of Thy Kingdom? When wilt Thou be unto me all in all? O when shall I be with Thee in Thy Kingdom which Thou hast prepared for Thy beloved from all eternity?

‘THOMAS A KEMPIS.

‘A little while,  
A little while, and we shall stand without  
No more, to hear His voice ; but enter in  
With joy unspeakable, to see His face. B. M.’ (p. 167).

A preface is prefixed by the Rev. T. B. Dover. It under-estimates, in our judgment, the value of formal methods of meditation and the number of persons to whom they are of use.

*Thoughts on Religion.* By the late GEORGE JOHN ROMANES, M.A., LL.D., F.R.S. Edited by CHARLES GORE, M.A., Canon of Westminster. (London : Longmans, Green, and Co., 1895.)

THE interest of this book is twofold—moral and intellectual. Morally it shows us the inner history of one who, owing a supreme allegiance to truth, has, in deference to its supposed claims, surrendered his belief in the Christian revelation, while at the same time he is conscious that, in doing so, he has also surrendered the best things which life can offer ; and who, not resting content with this negative attitude, struggles onward manfully through the clouds and darkness which, for him, veil the Divine Presence, until at last he regains the vision of Him who is the Object of science and religion alike, the Life of the world, and the Light of men. Intellectually the book makes it abundantly clear that the main cause of the scepticism of some scientists, in regard to the Christian faith, is due to the fact that they have not scrutinized the ultimate results of their investigations ; in other words, that in their case natural science has not been combined with metaphysics. There would be far less unbelief among scientists if they were also philosophers.

The plan of the book exhibits in an orderly sequence the progress of Romanes's thought. There are three main stages : the first is represented by the long extract in the editor's preface from the author's earlier work, *A Candid Examination of Theism*, and is the stage of thorough-going materialism ; the second is exhibited in the two essays which were written for the *Nineteenth Century*, but were never published, viz. ‘The Influence of Science upon Religion’ ; these constitute Part. I. of the present volume. In these essays the materialistic theory is definitely abandoned, while yet we are left with a wholly negative result ; for it is held that, although the universe is most rationally explained as due to an originating Mind, still we are totally unable to predicate anything of this Mind ; and, in particular, the facts of pain and suffering in animal and human life constrain us to deny to it the possession of moral attributes in any sense in which we can use the word ‘moral.’ The third stage is presented in the ‘Notes’ which form Part II., and which, in the editor's words, ‘are the sole reason for the existence of this volume.’ These ‘Notes’ were intended by Mr. Romanes to serve as a foundation for a work to be entitled *A Candid Examination of Religion*, which was meant to be a reply to the same author's earlier work, *A Candid Examination of Theism*. As the latter appeared under the pseudonym of ‘Physicus,’ so the former was to have borne the signature of ‘Metaphysicus.’ The result of this third and final stage is that while, from

the standpoint of reason, it is wholly rational to be a Christian believer, yet other ingredients besides reason—*i.e.* certain moral and spiritual qualities—enter into the composition of 'faith.' At this point the book leaves us. It is a beautiful but unfinished fragment of the history of one 'pure in heart,' who, after many trials and wanderings, was allowed 'to see God.' A note by the editor completes the history of Mr. Romanes' views on religion, and informs us that before his death he 'returned to that full, deliberate communion with the Church of Jesus Christ which he had for so many years been conscientiously compelled to forego' (p. 184).

In these 'Notes' there are three points of permanent value. These are the views of Mr. Romanes upon (1) the function of reason in relation to the subject-matter of religion; (2) the analysis of faith; and (3), above all, the nature of causation.

(1) He maintains that, from the purely rational standpoint, 'pure agnosticism' is the only attitude possible towards the doctrines of the Christian religion. 'Pure agnosticism' consists in approaching these doctrines without any *a priori* conceptions at all, while recognizing that reason cannot pronounce a verdict for or against statements regarding objects and relations which lie outside the phenomenal world. 'Impure agnosticism,' on the other hand, assumes that these objects and relations are *per se* 'unknowable' by man; that man has no faculties wherewith to investigate them (pp. 107 *seqq.*). Mr. Romanes arrives at the position of 'pure agnosticism' from the consideration of the proper subject-matter of reason, *viz.* our sense-perceptions. But we may add that the same result follows from the one condition upon which alone the exercise of reason is possible; for the presence of God in His universe constitutes that universe a rational unity, and therefore an object of thought, and His presence with the human mind is the illuminating power of reason. Therefore God, without whom no process of reason can possibly be valid, cannot Himself be the Object of any such process; His existence cannot be proved by any logical method: λόγου ἀρχὴ οὐ λόγος ἀλλὰ τι κρείττον· τί οὖν ἂν κρείττον καὶ ἐπιστήμης εἴποι πλὴν Θεός;<sup>1</sup> for to speak of 'proofs' of the Being of God is to conceive of Him as the last link in a chain of syllogistic reasoning; and the principle εἰσὶν ἄρα ἀρχαὶ ἐξ ὧν ὁ συλλογισμὸς, ὧν οὐκ ἔστι συλλογισμὸς<sup>2</sup> applies, above all, to Him who is the Supreme and Universal ἀρχὴ of all reason and all knowledge.

(2) The analysis of the nature of 'faith' is especially valuable (pp. 131-58). Reason enters as an element into the composition of faith, but reason by itself, as has been shown, is unable to apprehend God. Faith, which is the power of apprehending Him, is a complex act of the whole man, and demands the co-operation of every part of his threefold being, *viz.* of reason and desire and will. Because of this necessity of an act of the will in order to believe, faith is not merely an intellectual but a moral attribute of man. This is exactly what we should expect on the theory of man's earthly

<sup>1</sup> [Arist.] *Eth. Eud.* viii. 14.

<sup>2</sup> Arist. *Eth. Nic.* vi. 3.

existence as a moral probation, and this theory is the only rational account which we can give of the phenomenon of human life, while it supplies an answer to the difficulty previously raised as to the bearing of the fact of human suffering upon the moral character of God. This last point is hinted at, but not drawn out, on p. 142. Yet reason has an important part to play in relation to faith; e.g. reason can estimate the objective fact of the effects of faith over a large area of human life (pp. 147-53), and the continually increasing evidences of the authenticity and trustworthiness of the earliest Christian documents which have been obtained within the last few years, by the application of a careful criticism to the books of the New Testament.

(3) But the part of this book which seems to be of supreme and permanent value, and from which it gains an importance quite disproportionate to the size of the volume, is the analysis of the idea of causation (pp. 116 *seqq.*). In fact, the principles which Mr. Romanes there lays down will carry us much further than the conclusion at which he himself arrives, even into the very heart of essential Christian doctrine. The source of all the conflicts between science and religion in the past has been the assumption, implicitly or explicitly made on both sides, that, if we can point to a natural cause for any event or thing, we have thereby disproved its divine origin. Nothing can be further from the truth than this hypothesis. For the law of causation is the grand ultimate mystery of the universe. The truths that 'every fact which has a beginning has also a cause,'<sup>1</sup> and that the same cause always produces the same effect, are 'co-extensive with human experience.'

And yet, when we have discovered the 'cause' of a thing or event, we have come no nearer to the real explanation of it, for we can give no reason why effect *B* should always follow upon cause *A*. Thus, for example, the theory of evolution is that the different species of plants and animals which are found in our planet sprang from fewer and simpler forms in accordance with certain natural 'laws' or 'causes,' such as those of variation, of overproduction (whence the struggle for existence), of heredity (or the preservation of modifications found useful in the struggle of life), and of the survival of the fittest. But evolution fails to be an explanation of the universe, because it cannot tell us why living organisms should vary in this manner, produce offspring at such a rate, thus inherit, and thus survive. We are compelled to read the facts of our own nature into the external world; and to associate the ideas of causation and volition. Yet, although we believe, for our part, that all causation is due to will, we cannot regard this result as an inference from the point of view of pure reason, as Mr. Romanes is inclined to do (pp. 117-19); for we hold that reason can only present us with the phenomenon of a uniform sequence. A 'natural law' is only the formulated expression of the fact that the succession of events, *for us*, is always *A* followed by *B*, and never any other

<sup>1</sup> Mill, *Logic*, p. 212.

combination. Thus natural laws can only present us with subjective experiences, not with objective realities. Yet the idea of causation is as necessary a category of human thought as that of space or time, and whether subjective (and pure reason can only assure us of this) or objective remains as the 'mystery of mysteries.' The advance of science, exhibiting 'natural causation' in every department of experience, while entirely destructive of the Deistic idea of God as a *τεχνίτης* (common to Paley and his opponents), does not destroy, but rather, with increasing force, compels us to return to the Athanasian view of Him as *ὁ κτίστης*. And thus an analysis of the idea of causation brings us to the doctrine of God's immanence in creation, which has not been neglected (as Mr. Romanes implies, p. 120) by the best Christian thinkers in the past. It is not a new theory, but part and parcel of the theology of such Christian thinkers as Athanasius and Augustine, that the distinction between the 'natural' and the 'supernatural' is not absolute, but only relative to us; that all natural causation is the expression of the Divine Will immanent in creation; that, to use in a modified form the illustration of a French philosopher, the Resurrection of Jesus Christ is not more miraculous, but at the same time not less miraculous, than the budding of a rose. We think that Mr. Romanes should have noticed that the doctrine of God's immanence in nature was insisted upon by Christian theology nearly eighteen centuries before the birth of Darwin (St. John i. 3, 4). The second criticism which we have to offer is that the author has not perceived (or at least has not expressed the thought) that the only possible reconciliation of the transcendence of God postulated by religion, and His 'immanence' postulated by science, is to be found in the Christian doctrine of the *ΛΟΓΟΣ*—in other words, of the Christian view of God as the Triune Being. We can only regret in this connexion that, owing to the premature death of the author, the promise made on p. 120 (*i.e.* a discussion upon the 'possibility of the union' of 'immanence' and 'personality') has not been fulfilled.

There are also certain individual statements which invite, and indeed compel, criticism. The doctrine of the Incarnation is regarded as a 'particular dogma' (p. 105), an 'ecclesiastical dogma' (p. 109)—that is, as an element which can be removed from the Christian religion, while leaving a residuum which can be still called 'Christianity.' This surely is a misuse of language, for by the withdrawal of the Incarnation 'Christianity' is entirely evacuated of its essence. Nor can we assent to the opinion that the language used by Christ of Himself is compatible with the supposition that His Personality was superhuman—that is, angelic, but not Divine (see p. 107 and editor's note thereon). Such a view is irreconcilable with passages like St. Matthew xi. 25-30 (=St. Luke x. 21-4) and St. Matthew xxviii. 19—that is, with the Synoptic representation of our Lord's words, leaving out of sight the discourses in St. John's Gospel.

There is as serious a misconception on p. 145, where the 'doctrine of the vileness of the body' is stated to be 'scarcely less distinctive' of Christianity than that of the resurrection of the body.



It is needless to say more on this subject, except that the doctrine in question is Manichæan and not Christian. The mistake is apparently due to the unfortunate mistranslation of Phil. iii. 21, which is perpetuated in the Burial Office of our Church.

The doctrine of the Fall of Man is not affected by evolution, certainly not 'hard hit' by it (pp. 176-7): for the doctrine of the Fall does not imply that the first man enjoyed all the gifts and developed faculties possessed by his latest and most cultured descendants; it does not deny the fact of progress. But it does involve the belief that the first man originally stood in a right relation to God, which he forfeited by the first act of conscious disobedience, and that, in consequence, human progress has not been what God meant it to be; in other words, that the orderly development of man has been marred and interrupted in the highest—the moral—region of his being by the fact of sin. And this doctrine is in harmony with the facts of moral experience, which reason is bound to take into account. There is an admirable passage upon this subject in Mr. A. L. Moore's *Essays Literary and Scientific*, from which we would quote the following: 'It is because he [the Christian evolutionist] sees in sin the great obstacle to the true development of man that he claims on the side of progress the Gospel of One who came "to save His people from their sins"' (p. 66). Mr. Romanes goes on to state that 'long before Darwin the story of man in Paradise was recognized by thoughtful theologians as allegorical.' True; but this 'recognition' of an 'allegorical' element has reference only to the framework of the narrative, and not to the great spiritual truths of the creation of man in the Image of God and to the defacement of that Image by the Fall, which are conveyed in that 'allegorical' framework. It is obviously impossible to deny these truths without denying the inspiration of the first chapters of Genesis, and there is the widest possible difference between the statement that the sacred narrative is not meant to teach geological or historical but spiritual truth, and the statement that this spiritual teaching itself is positively false and misleading.

Lastly, the passage on 'Christian demonology' (pp. 180-2) does not seem consistent with an attitude of 'pure agnosticism.' No better criticism, however, could have been passed upon it than that contained in the editor's note (p. 180). Certainly Christianity could not accept the 'hypothesis of the mendacity of Christ,' nor even of His 'ignorance,' if by 'ignorance' we mean a want of knowledge which could result in untrue statements concerning the spiritual world.

Yet, in spite of the criticisms which we have felt it our duty to offer, this book contains, as we have pointed out, elements of permanent interest and value both for scientists and theologians. More especially, if scientific men would adopt the views on causation here enunciated by Mr. Romanes, the last vestiges of the fancied opposition between science and religion would finally disappear. The Christian student, as he rises from the perusal of *Thoughts on Religion*, may well 'thank God and take courage.'

*Studies in the Christian Character.* Sermons, with an Introductory Essay, by FRANCIS PAGET, D.D., Dean of Christ Church, Oxford. (London : Longmans, Green, and Co., 1895.)

THIS volume of Sermons shows that the mantle of the late Dean of St. Paul's has fallen upon the shoulders of the Dean of Christ Church. Both in subject matter and general treatment, in style and diction, as well as by frequent reference to his writings, we are reminded of R. W. Church ; and yet Dr. Paget is no mere imitator or reproducer of what has already been said, but he has, so to speak, happily grafted his own independent studies of Christian character upon the stock of acquired knowledge which was already the precious heritage of the English Church. A volume of sermons which can be enjoyed in the study as much as in the congregation is a great boon, and these sermons thoroughly repay the reading. They are addressed to an intellectual audience, they appeal to the moral sense of persons accustomed to think, but they never cease to be practical ; and they are full of deeply spiritual thoughts. Besides, the beauty of the language, the careful balancing of the sentences, and the proportion of the several parts will prove attractive to many readers. Perhaps there is here and there a little too much elaboration, and, possibly, for those who heard them delivered there would be a feeling of monotony where everything is so perfected. The reader, however, does not experience this in the same degree that the hearer does ; but, as he reads and enjoys these sermons, he will probably be struck by three special excellences. First, the whole series contributes—not all of them equally, but all in some measure—to an appreciation of the Christian character. The title of the volume is not, as so often, the title of one or two sermons, but it covers them all, and each sermon adds something to our knowledge of this subject. Secondly, we find ourselves far away from theological controversy and the 'higher criticism,' and feel that we can study without interruption the bearing of God's word upon the habits, tempers, and motives of the Christian life, while all the great verities of the Christian Faith are assumed to be accepted by those who hear. Thirdly, we experience help and encouragement in the illustrations of Christian character which are drawn from the works of great painters (pp. 96, 163), from poetry (pp. 19, 20, 138), from well-known literature (pp. 58, 250, 257), but, above all, from the characters of men, both living and departed, who were conspicuous for some excellence both in Oxford and in the world outside (cf. Sermons VI., XIX., and XX.)

The Sermons are preceded by an Essay on the Study of the Christian Character, which suggests three lines of thought : (1) that it is a great safeguard against formalism, (2) that it appeals to those who doubt the truth of Christianity, (3) that its capacity for meeting constant change of circumstances makes it probable that it will be of as great utility in the future as in the past. In this essay there is an abundance of good things about the formation and powers of the Christian character, but we must refrain from quoting more than the following, viz. :

1. 'That which has been marked as the characteristic note of the Psalter is also the secret of the mysteriousness which is felt through all the simplicity and homeliness of the Christian character; a mysteriousness out of which emerges its power to control and overawe mere force and to make cleverness uncomfortable. It bears about it the air of God's Presence; it is accustomed to the ways of His Court; its indifference to the world rests on a glad and loving deference to Him; in communion with Him it has received the distinction for which nothing upon earth accounts' (p. xviii).

2. 'It does seem clear that those who deny the Divinity of Christ must think that the Christian character was introduced and realized and propagated and maintained under strangely incongruous and uncongenial conditions. It certainly does not look like a character that has started up out of an enthusiastic delusion, an exaggerated and misguided devotion, a fanatical misunderstanding of a teacher's meaning, a credulous fostering of irrational hopes and fancies; still less can the thought of it be brought into connexion with any wilful or self-deceiving fraud' (p. xxvi).

The whole passage, developing the same argument, is very powerful, but too long for quotation (see pp. xxvi-vii).

3. 'The sort of men Christ's servants come to be, the traits they take and perfect as they move towards death, are a fair token what it really is that they hope to find beyond death. Few things tell on character more surely and precisely than the goal on which the heart is set and the temper in which that goal is sought. And certainly the Christian character, as it appears in Christ-like lives, does not look at all as though it had been formed and fostered and determined by a mercenary attention to a selfish aim. For the faculties and the capacity that grow in those who try to be true to Christ in daily life are strikingly ill suited for the opportunities of enjoyment which might be imagined in a heaven of selfishness. Christians do not grow in the capacity for selfish pleasure, nor attain an exceptional power of relishing to the utmost a separate and individual gratification. The faculty which they develop is the faculty of self-denial; of glad, unhindered self-forgetfulness for others' sake; of delighting in goodness and eliciting what is best in others; of simple, cheerful, unclouded self-surrender' (pp. xxxv-vi).

The Sermons, though not so arranged, fall naturally into groups by the occasions on which they were delivered. There are (1) the College Sermons during Term, (2) the Sermons preached in the Cathedral on the Great Holy Days, (3) the Sermons delivered before the University at other times, and (4) those which were preached on special occasions in Oxford or elsewhere. 1. On the whole we prefer the College Sermons for some things—*e.g.* those on the Lord's Day, the Simplicity of Goodness, Patriotism, &c.—because they are a trifle less elaborate than some others, and contain those illustrations from persons, living or deceased, of which we have spoken. We like what is said about the value of Sunday (pp. 37, 38), especially this idea, which is well worked out: 'For Sunday is our best, if not our only, hope of self-preservation in the true meaning of the term;' and the analysis of 'simple goodness' (pp. 74, 75) is delightful, nor could the thought be more appropriately illustrated than it is (pp. 75-8) by the lives of certain Oxford men. 2. We must confess to a little disappointment in those sermons which the Dean preaches by custom on Christmas

VOL. XL.—NO. LXXIX.

Q

Day, Good Friday, and Ascension Day, because we should have liked more dogmatic teaching. We feel that the mystery of the Incarnation demanded more explicit treatment than it receives in Sermons X., XI., XII.; and the same is true of the Good Friday Sermons (XIII., XIV.), and perhaps it is even more noticeable here. 'The confession of dependence' is not all that we should expect in the exposition of those mysterious words 'I thirst,' nor do we like 'Sins of Ignorance' considered on such a day apart from the work of the Great Advocate of sinners, who pleads for the forgiveness. During Lent the subject would have been natural, but it is hardly so, by itself, on Good Friday. The Ascension Day Sermons (XXI., XXII.) answer our expectations on this point better: we particularly like the second one, which is the last of the volume. There are, however, in this group of Sermons some passages of great beauty, of solemn impressiveness, and exhibiting a wonderful insight into human character. We would instance the effect of the Divine Presence of the Incarnate Saviour upon human life (pp. 118-9), the guilt that attaches to and the forgiveness necessary for sins of ignorance (pp. 156-9), and 'the true calling of a human soul into the very Presence of Almighty God,' what it would feel as to its own unpreparedness (pp. 241, 242). These are passages which make these Sermons well worth studying, but we still regret the scantiness of dogmatic teaching. 3. Among the University Sermons that which will attract most attention, we expect, will be the 'Safeguard of Judgment' (No. II.): it is founded upon Wordsworth's lines written in London (1791), viz.:

'It is not wholly so to him who looks  
In steadiness, who hath among least things  
An under-sense of greatest' (pp. 19, 20).

Its adaptation to those who mix in University life is admirable (pp. 21-3), as is also the illustration from St. Paul's calmness of thought while he wrote his Epistles from the great cities of the Roman Empire (pp. 24, 25).

4. Among the occasional Sermons we may instance the 'Work of God's Word' (No. IV.), where we have a most beautiful description of the influence of Bible study upon the Christian character (pp. 49-52), from which we will take one short passage, viz.:

'It is the character of holiness, the character of the saints; the book whose influence has quickened, and directed, and chastened, and upheld it is the Bible; and the everlasting type that gives it those unchanging notes of moral beauty is to be seen in Jesus Christ our Lord' (p. 51).

We will conclude with a quotation from Sermon XVII., 'Honouring all Men,' which will repay careful reading, even though we may know Dr. Liddon's great University Sermon on the same subject, for the treatment is different—a passage which describes what Grace can do for the reformation of human character, viz.:

'St. Peter lived in daily contact with those who were made pure and strong and holy by the grace of God. He saw, indeed, how low men could sink down in lust and cruelty; he saw the monstrous vices of a

corrupt, licentious civilization; he took account of all that. But in the midst of such things he saw again and again a strange growth; he saw forms of moral splendour springing up, surpassing all that men had thought possible. Out of the very depths of the wickedness around him there came characters that he could only watch with silent awe and astonishment and joy; characters with deep reserves of tenderness and strength, blending, into a type undreamt of, traits of beauty which had before been set in contrast; characters in which all men who could think and feel might see a sight more moving and affecting and controlling than any glory of the world of sense, in nature or in art' (pp. 193, 194).

*Chapters from some Memoirs.* By ANNE THACKERAY RITCHIE.  
(London: Macmillan and Co., 1894.)

THIS book is perfectly charming. It introduces us to all sorts of well-known characters in literature and art, and gives us glimpses of the inner life of many interesting persons in the earlier part of this century both in France and Germany, in London and at Rome. The only difficulty is to abstain from quoting all the delightful bits. The first four chapters deal with English life in Paris at various periods down to the end of the war with Germany, and we make the acquaintance of some amusing characters. Jasmin, the barber poet, and Madame, the professor of history, with her dog Bibi, are quite out of the common. Probably most readers will find the child's impressions of Napoleon's funeral (pp. 29-30) the most interesting description, but to our minds the incident of hearing Chopin play is a pathetic memoir of that unfortunate musician's sad life which deserves to be added to the ordinary biographical notices of him.

'It was opened by a slight, delicate-looking man, with long hair, bright eyes, and a thin, hooked nose. When Miss X. saw him she hastily put down her basket upon the floor, caught both his hands in hers, began to shake them gently and to scold him in an affectionate, reproving way for having come to the door. He laughed, said he had guessed who it was, and motioned to her to enter, and I followed into a narrow little room, with no furniture in it whatever but an upright piano against the wall and a few straw chairs standing on the wooden shiny floor. He made us sit down with some courtesy, and in reply to her questions said he was pretty well. Had he slept? He shook his head. Had he eaten? He shrugged his shoulders, and then he pointed to the piano. He had been composing something—I remember that he spoke in an abrupt, light sort of way—would Miss X. like to hear it? "She would like to hear it," she answered, "of course, she would dearly like to hear it; but it would tire him to play; it could not be good for him." He smiled again, shook back his long hair, and sat down immediately; and then the music began, and the room was filled with continuous sound, he looking over his shoulder now and then to see if we were liking it. The lady sat absorbed and listening, and as I looked at her I saw tears in her eyes—great clear tears rolling down her cheeks, while the music poured on and on' (pp. 25-6). 'She looked hard at me as we drove away. "Never forget that you have heard Chopin play," she said with emotion, "for soon no one will ever hear him play any more"' (p. 27). 'I have remembered this little scene' (says Mrs. Ritchie) 'with comfort and pleasure, and known that he was not altogether alone in life, and that he had good friends who cared for his genius and tended him to the last' (p. 28).

Out of the 'Witches' Caldron,' as the next two chapters are called, we cannot refrain from quoting Mrs. Ritchie's recollections of Charlotte Brontë, viz.

'A guest never to be forgotten by me, a tiny, delicate little person, whose small hand nevertheless grasped a mighty lever which set all the literary world of that day vibrating' (p. 60). 'The door opens wide, and the two gentlemen come in, leading a tiny, delicate, serious little lady, pale, with fair straight hair and steady eyes. She may be a little over thirty; she is dressed in a little *barège* dress with a pattern of faint green moss. She enters in mittens, in silence, in seriousness; our hearts are beating with wild excitement. . . . This, then, is the authoress, the unknown power whose books have set all London talking, reading, speculating; some people even say our father wrote the books—the wonderful books.' (p. 61). 'We all smile as my father stoops to offer his arm; for, genius though she may be, Miss Brontë can barely reach his elbow' (p. 61).

We can sympathize with the little girl who 'blushed up and burst into tears' when she was spoken to by an old man (Mr. Samuel Rogers), who stood 'nodding his head like a Chinese mandarin with an ivory face,' and said to her, 'My little girl, will you come and live with me? You shall be as happy as the day is long; you shall have a white pony to ride and feed upon red-currant jelly' (p. 69). In London we are brought into touch with many persons whose names and writings are still household words to us. For instance, we are shown what an influence Charles Dickens had upon the Thackeray family in more ways than one.

'I can remember, when *David Copperfield* came out, hearing him [W. M. Thackeray] saying with emphasis to my grandmother that "little Em'ly's letter to old Peggotty was a masterpiece." I wondered to hear him at the time, for that was not at all the part I cared for most, nor indeed could I imagine how little Em'ly ever was so stupid as to run away from Peggotty's enchanted house-boat. But we each and all enjoyed in turn our share of those thin green books full of delicious things, and how glad we were when they came to our hands at last, after our elders and our governess and our butler had all read them in turn' (p. 78).

In a later chapter Mrs. Ritchie bears witness again to this influence of Dickens by saying—

'Early life is like a chapter out of Dickens, I think—one *sees* people then: their tricks of expression, their vivid sayings, and their quaint humours and oddities do not surprise one; one accepts everything as a matter of course—no matter how unusual it may be' (p. 192).

The mention of 'our butler' in the passage quoted above reminds us that 'Jeames de la Pluche' was an important person in the Thackeray household, being not only invaluable in his thoughtfulness and attention, but also famous as a literary character, who on a memorable occasion presented the family with a china 'breakfast array' and 'a copy of verses, not written, but put together out of printed letters from the *Times*' (p. 84). Years afterwards he told Mr. Thackeray reproachfully, 'I sent you the breakfast things; you guessed a great many people, but you never guessed they came from me.' Then we are taken to John Leech's study, and see him



at work for *Punch* (pp. 93-8); we see Thackeray in a flutter before his first lecture in Willis's Rooms, and Mrs. Kemble coming to his rescue, and the Duchess of Sutherland in her 'little Quaker cap' among the audience (pp. 123-7); and we are taken to Cheyne Row, Chelsea, and get excellent portraits of Mr. and Mrs. Carlyle. Of the latter we are told—

'Gainsborough should have been alive to paint her; slim, bright, dark-eyed, upright, in her place. She looked like one of the grand ladies our father used sometimes to take us to call upon. She used to be handsomely dressed in velvet and point lace. She sat there at leisure, and prepared for conversation. She was not familiar, but cordial, dignified, and interested in everything as she sat installed in her corner of the sofa by one of the little tables covered with nicknacks of silver and mother-of-pearl' (p. 135).

Of Carlyle himself his wife is quoted as saying, 'If you wish for a quiet life, never you marry a dyspeptic man of genius' (p. 136). From London we return to the Continent; to Weimar and Goethe's family (pp. 113-7); to a country residence near Corbeil, in France, and get a peep at some queer neighbours at the château (pp. 164-5); and to Rome, *viâ* Marseilles and Genoa, to mix 'with a number of interesting people, all drinking of the waters of Trevi,' with the intention of returning in person or in spirit (pp. 173-4). But the 'bonne bouche' at the close of a delicious repast is found in the last chapter, where we are given an admirable sketch of Mrs. Kemble. One sees her from all points of view, both in public and in private life, and though we may laugh at her peculiarities in dress (pp. 198-9) we must admire Mrs. Ritchie's portrait of her in features and character (pp. 203-5), and, above all, we must delight in 'her great and fervent piety' (pp. 214-5). Altogether one could not wish for a pleasanter volume of memoirs.

*In the Light of Christ.* Sermons preached in the Church of St. Paul, Newton Abbot, during Lent 1894, by ARTHUR HENNELL SIMMS, M.A., Rector of Wolborough. (London: Skeffington and Son, 1895.)

THIS volume contains two courses of Lenten Sermons, the first dealing with 'Modern Life in the Light of Christ,' from which the title of the book comes, and the second expounding 'the Seven Seals' of Revel. v.-viii. 1. The first series is more finished and more original than the second, which the author acknowledges to be based on Dean Vaughan's *Lectures on the Revelation*; but in both courses of Sermons there is a certain power of making the problems of life and the hard things of God's Word yield a practical lesson. We think the style somewhat difficult for a mixed congregation, and some of the subjects to be beyond the ordinary grasp; but, as each sermon recapitulates the line of thought which has gone before, the general purpose of the teaching would be obvious even to those who did not take in all that was said. In the second series it is apparently assumed that the congregation is familiar with the Book of Revelation and its methods of presenting great truths: we think that the

exposition of this difficult portion of Scripture might have been made much more simple and more useful by adopting the Bible-class method. As it is, a great deal of the argument and illustration is thrown away upon an audience which is not accustomed to minute study of the Apocalypse. The first series is easier to follow, because it deals with everyday facts, *e.g.* society, divided Christendom, scepticism and infidelity, philanthropy, the problem of evil; and the consideration of these subjects leads appropriately to the thought of the Church as 'the living witness,' like the Virgin Mother standing by the Cross and pointing (as it were) to the Crucified as the remedy for all these difficulties. We like Sermons II. and III. most, because there are some things said in them which require to be said again and again, *e.g.* (on p. 16)—

'Christian rules without the Living Christ are no more likely to prevail than the rules of any society which aims at the moral welfare of mankind. Not the precepts of the Sermon on the Mount itself, applied with the utmost literalness, can have force to bring the scattered elements of society together.' 'He did not trust to the handing on of certain definite precepts, as those of His followers seem to think who appear to read nothing but the Sermon on the Mount. He formed a Church.'

The preacher had said the same thing in the previous sermon (pp. 13-14).

'A set of rules is a set of rules, whether it is to command the "offering of the other cheek" or to command a war of extermination. The really important question is, Who gives the rules? The Christian rules without the Living Christ are no more likely to prevail than the rules of the Peace Society, or of any society for promoting temperance, or purity, or what you will. It is not the system which must come first, but the Man.'

In Sermon III. there are some remarks on modern literature (pp. 33, 34) and on modern education (pp. 34-6) which are worthy of attention; but we must not do more than quote these sentences: 'The literature of the day is a barometer of public opinion; it rises and falls by reason of an influence outside itself.' 'Why, asks a well-known Frenchman in a recent number of a widely-read Parisian paper,<sup>1</sup> is there such an outbreak of Anarchism in France? And he answers, It is because we have ceased to teach the Christian faith in our schools.' If we had space we would gladly quote what is said (on pp. 37, 38) about the speculative tendencies of science, and the remarkable phenomenon that religion cannot be kept out of mind, however much men try to banish it from them. We think that the preacher lost an opportunity in dealing with scepticism and infidelity: he does not suggest a remedy. Probably none of his hearers had any tendency to such an attitude towards religion; but if he had taught them how to deal with persons who had such a tendency he would have done well. There is a passage in the Sermon entitled 'The Divine Calm' which suggests this criticism (p. 177). 'People are fond of fixing you in an apparent dilemma in this way. If you cannot tell them as much about the Divine purpose as you might be

<sup>1</sup> M. Jules Simon, in *Figaro*.

able to tell them about the purpose of your next-door neighbour they turn triumphantly upon you and ask what your faith is worth.' Religious men and women need to be taught how they are to act, and how they are to answer, in the presence of an unbeliever. Sermon IV., on 'Philanthropy,' is somewhat obscure: it overlooks the fact that most philanthropists, whom *we* have to deal with, are baptized, although their actions are not always guided by a Christian motive. In Sermon V. the thought of the world providing remedies for pain as an evil, for crime, and for low morality, in the way of philanthropy, legal restrictions, and secular education (p. 68), leaving religion out of account, is one that deserves attention. The general line of the sermons on the 'Seven Seals' is summed up in the following passage:

'Against the conflicts of existence, O Christ, set Thy patience and Thy love; against its selfishness, the spirit of Thy sacrifice; against its want, Thy victorious endurance, born of that "hunger and thirst after righteousness" which God will always satisfy; against its sad mortality set Thy glorious hope, Thy life-giving power; break down the pride of the ungodly, and claim their souls; give the oppressed the white robe of absolution; make them free in that liberty of Christ wherein their true nature may find its perfect scope' (p. 170).

*The Work of the Holy Spirit.* Thirteen Sermons with an Appendix by S. C. LOWRY, M.A., Vicar of North Holmwood, Dorking. (London: Skeffington and Son, 1894.)

It may be the case that the work of the Holy Spirit does not receive as much attention as it should in the pulpits of the Church. If it be so it cannot be from lack of opportunity and encouragement, for the Book of Common Prayer suggests the treatment of it at other times than Pentecost. It may be pointed out that the Collects for the Fifth Sunday after Easter, the Sunday after Ascension Day, and the Ninth and Nineteenth Sundays after Trinity, the Epistle for the Eighth Sunday after Trinity, and the Gospels for the Fourth Sunday after Easter, the Sunday after Ascension Day, the First and Second Sundays after Trinity are opportunities for teaching about the Holy Spirit. The parish priest who follows the guidance of the Liturgy will not allow the doctrine of the Holy Spirit to become a 'forgotten truth,' and will not incur the reproach of any 'aged layman' on this point. Mr. Lowry has done well both to preach and to publish these Sermons, although they do not cover as much ground as we could desire, because they may stir up some of the clergy to preach more upon this subject. We do not feel, however, that there is any deficiency of hymns in honour of the Holy Spirit; *Hymns Ancient and Modern* include plenty, and among them some of the most popular in the collection. And the number of excellent books available for the clergy—e.g. Mr. Moule's *Veni Creator*, Archdeacon Hare's *Mission of the Comforter*, and Bishop Moberly's *Bampton Lectures*, 1868—make the study of the doctrine comparatively easy. We wonder that the Holy Spirit is not more frequently considered in Lenten sermons; for systematic teaching on this subject by the parish priest would be preferable to this incessant running about after strange preachers for the sake of spiritual excitement. We do

not, of course, expect to find anything new in sermons upon the work of the Holy Spirit, but we do expect a fairly exhaustive treatment of the subject in thirteen discourses, even though they were not delivered as a consecutive series. We were sorry, therefore, not to find a sermon upon the Divine Personality of the Holy Ghost, and another upon His relations to the Church. The last six clauses of the Apostles' Creed bring out most valuable teaching about the operations of God the Holy Ghost, and the four great notes or marks of the Church—unity, sanctity, Catholicity, Apostolicity—are mostly due to His indwelling energy. But we miss all these points in Mr. Lowry's volume. The study of the Greek Testament in Romans i. 4 and Hebrews ix. 14 would have checked the hasty assumption that 'the Spirit of holiness' and 'the Eternal Spirit' were titles of the Holy Ghost (Sermon III. and App. iv.), for in all probability, as the context requires, both passages refer to the Divine nature of our Lord, and in 1 Thessal. v. 19 it is a mistake to regard τὸ πνεῦμα as Personal, for the Holy Ghost Himself cannot be 'quenched,' whereas His spiritual gifts, of which the passage speaks, can be 'quenched,' 'despised,' and 'proved.' The same error appears (Sermon VII.) in connexion with Acts xix. 2, for the Ephesian disciples knew nothing of the miraculous gifts of the Spirit: πνεῦμα ἅγιον must mean the same thing in both clauses, viz. not the *Person*, but the *gifts* of the Holy Ghost. An opportunity is lost in teaching about the Holy Ghost when the work of the Paraclete is not illustrated by Romans viii. 16, 26, because the word 'Comforter' left unexplained is misleading to English minds. Mr. Lowry says nothing to make it understood. Sermon IX., 'Unity and Diversity,' is by far the most interesting of the series, and we agree that 'the double portion' asked for by Elisha is probably the elder son's share; but we wonder if Mr. Lowry has ever read Isaac Williams's sermon on 'Elisha,'<sup>1</sup> for he would see that there was much in Elisha's life and work to be urged for the other view, viz. that Elisha had 'double' the share of the Holy Spirit that his master Elijah had had. To the sermon on 'Confirmation' (VII.) we are bound to object (1) that the attack on the Church of Rome and on Protestantism was quite unnecessary (pp. 53-5); we find the same kind of attack in Sermon X. (p. 78), where Mr. Lowry does not perceive that the story which he quotes is obviously a Mohammedan invention in order to disparage Christianity: (2) that his idea of Confirmation is too subjective; we cannot believe that the ordinance 'is barren of results' (p. 57) because there is not 'any real desire to receive the aid of the Holy Ghost'; we cannot believe that the Holy Ghost's coming depends upon the person's disposition, or we should be compelled to give up infant baptism: (3) that too much is made of the case of the Quakers (p. 58); such a position would go far to deny the necessity of Confirmation, whereas, in the matter of the Quakers, if what Mr. Lowry says is true, 'exceptio probat regulam.' The weak point of these Sermons is the sacramental doctrine. However much some Churchmen would like to

<sup>1</sup> *Old Testament Characters*, xxi.

see the Invocation of the Holy Spirit upon the elements restored to the Consecration Prayer in our Liturgy, we must not say 'the Holy Ghost is the real Consecrator' (p. 46). Surely, according to Western ideas, Christ is the real Consecrator in His own ordinance; we act in His name; the Holy Spirit is God's agent for bringing about the result for which we pray, and it cannot be necessary to instruct God how to accomplish what we ask Him to do. The truth is, our Consecration Prayer involves the Invocation, although we do not mention the Holy Spirit. And why should Mr. Lowry throw any doubt upon the English manner of ordaining priests (p. 48)? Here again we Westerns have our own custom, and we need not regret that we differ from the Easterns in little points such as a *direct* instead of a *precatory* form of words. It would have been well if Mr. Lowry had taught more definitely on the subject of baptismal regeneration, and had at least mentioned absolution and the power of the keys as the result of our Lord's breathing of the Spirit upon the Apostles (St. John xx. 22, 23). We recommend Mr. Lowry to read Bishop Moberly's *The Administration of the Holy Spirit in the Body of Christ* (Bampton Lectures, 1868) before he continues his sermons on this subject. The Appendix is a good idea, but not sufficiently complete, as there is no table of passages bearing on the Spirit's work in the Church; the objective side of His work needs to be enforced along with the subjective.

*The Virgin Mother.* Retreat Addresses by the Right Rev. A. C. A. HALL, D.D., Bishop of Vermont. (New York: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1894.)

ADDRESSES delivered in Retreats necessarily lose much of their force and attractiveness by being published from notes and being read by those who had not the privilege of hearing them from the conductor's lips. It will, no doubt, strike many who read the present volume that the subject is drawn out to an inordinate length. Two Addresses are devoted to the Predestination and Training of the Virgin Mother for her vocation; there is one upon the Flight into Egypt; and the last is upon the Virgin Mother waiting for the Gift of the Holy Ghost. We think that there is something fanciful in this study of the Virgin Mother's life, especially as there is no address upon the scene where she stands outside the crowd with our Lord's brethren, desiring to speak with Him. Bishop Hall's only allusions to this scene are in his first address, where he says (1) in reference to St. Luke xi. 27, 28, 'He is not denying His Mother's honour, but only referring that honour and praise to its truest, deepest cause'; and (2) in reference to St. Matt. xii. 46-50, 'At once repudiating any merely natural relationship that would interfere with His heavenly Father's work, and at the same time declaring that all may have a share in Mary's highest prerogative' (pp. 3, 4). We think this scene would have lent itself to practical lessons quite as much as the flight into Egypt (which, after all, belongs to Joseph's obedience), or the scene in the upper room (Acts i. 14), where 'the Mother of Jesus' is among those who are gathered together praying. We draw atten-

tion to this omission because Bishop Hall says in his last address (p. 205), 'We have dwelt on every instance in which she comes before us in the Gospel narrative.' We are also surprised to find no allusion anywhere to Galat. iv. 4, 'made of a woman'—we should have expected it in the essay on 'The Virgin Birth,' because, considering the context, it would have served the writer's purpose quite as well as the quotation from St. Ignatius, *Trall.* 9 (p. 221)—and we should have liked some exposition (on p. 188) of 'the piercing sword,' in reference to its context (St. Luke ii. 35), in the meditation on the Crucifixion.

While there are in these Addresses many things to be thankful for there is a great deal which we cannot accept. We shall give specimens of either kind. There are some excellent remarks (pp. 48, 49) about vocation, whether for sisterhood or priesthood, though the warning against turning the home into a convent is marred by one phrase, 'acting as a sort of demi-semi Sister of mercy.' Again, on pp. 53-4 the necessity of a right disposition on our part in order to appropriate grace is admirably put; e.g. 'Absolution will never stand in the place of contrition. There is no more deadly snare than confession without repentance. There is an old Latin motto which says, 'Tanta gratia quanta dispositio.' So on pp. 73, 74 the duty of joy, even in the midst of outward sorrow, is illustrated by the Church's use of the *Magnificat* upon her fasting days equally with her festivals. So on pp. 79-81 there is helpful teaching about the Incarnation, and on pp. 93-5 upon the analogy between the Incarnation and the Eucharist; e.g.—

'It is a common devotional expression to speak of the *miracle* of the Blessed Sacrament. It is, really and truly, no miracle at all. It is a *mystery*. A *miracle* involves the suspension of the ordinary laws of nature by the intervention of some higher law. But this is not the case with the Blessed Sacrament. . . . And just so is it in the Incarnation. There is no *miracle*, but a great *mystery* in the union of the Divine and Human Natures in One Person. God is not changed into Man, and the Manhood is not made Divine; but Human Nature, in its perfection, is taken up into the Divine in the Person of Christ, without any change or impairing of His original dignity. . . . The only *miracle* about the Incarnation was in the Virgin Birth—in the manner of His entrance into the world.'

On pp. 111, 112, 113 we have some useful remarks upon the distinction between 'sin' and 'sinfulness,' and 'the distinction between the special cleansing given in Absolution and the cleansing power of the Body and Blood of Christ in Holy Communion.' For these helps in doctrinal teaching we are grateful to Bishop Hall. But we cannot say as much for the following: on p. 7 the Scotist view of the Incarnation is maintained, as if it was the only reasonable view: 'It was probably God's original, eternal purpose that His Son should become Incarnate and assume our human nature, quite apart from the after necessity of restoring that nature;' and on p. 8, 'Sin came in and modified that original plan of God.' We prefer to hold with Dr. Liddon (on Rom. viii. 3) that 'περὶ ἀμαρτίας seems to



negative the Scotist hypothesis that the Incarnation would have taken place if man had not fallen. Cf. Heb. ii. 14.' We must also take exception to the view expressed (on pp. 87, 88) concerning the limitations of our Lord's human knowledge. He asks, 'Why should people find a difficulty in accepting any limitations?' We are constrained to reply that Scripture does not authorize us in so doing, except in one point (St. Mark xiii. 32). We likewise dislike what Bishop Hall has written about the vicarious character of Christ's sufferings on p. 147; e.g. 'He is not our Substitute, He is our great Leader and Representative. He did not die that we might not die.' We consider that is contradictory of the plain assertion of Scripture in Gal. ii. 20, 'Who loved me and gave Himself for me,'<sup>1</sup> and the emphatic use of ἀντὶ, not merely ὑπέρ, in St. Matt. xx. 28, together with ἀντὶ πάντων ὑπέρ πάντων in 1 Tim. ii. 6. The idea of *substitution* must not be excluded from our Lord's death, however much it may have been exaggerated in former times. Then we should like to ask Bishop Hall what authority he has for stating (pp. 30-1) that St. Mary 'had as a girl dedicated her maidenhood entirely to God's service,' and 'had foregone that great hope,' viz. of being the mother of the Messiah, when at the very time of the Annunciation she was the espoused wife of Joseph. And is not the phrase 'Think of Mary singing the *Magnificat* (1) as the representative of humanity, the second Eve' (p. 61), an exaggeration, which, if it finds some support in a passage of Irenæus (bk. III. xxxii.), is liable to introduce confusion into the relations of the Virgin Mother and her Divine Son? We think also that to say (p. 164) 'the marriage feast at Cana was the occasion of St. John's introduction to St. Mary' shows a disregard of the fact that Salome, the Virgin Mother's sister (St. John xix. 25), was that apostle's mother, and therefore he was St. Mary's nephew; and we see little use in perpetuating the error of the *Stabat Mater* that the Virgin Mother remained upon Calvary through the three hours of darkness and heard the fourth saying from the Cross (p. 189): this is not the natural view of St. John xix. 27. However, in spite of all that we have urged against this little book, there is plenty in the Addresses which is thoroughly devotional and practical, and there is no shirking of the great doctrinal points upon which this teaching is based. We think that the whole might have been curtailed for publication with advantage. We have noticed misprints—on p. 43, 'commanded' for 'commended'; p. 55, 'Isreal'; p. 78, 'St. Jude xx.' for '20.'

*The Catholic Revival of the Nineteenth Century.* Six Lectures by GEORGE WORLEY, with an Introduction by the Dean of St. Paul's. (London: 1894.)

THIS little book has a value of its own. It has evidently been written, as the Dean says in the brief Introduction, by a man who had no personal relations with the writers of the *Tracts for the Times*, and who, probably, never spoke to any one of them. It contains the story of the progress of events as they seemed to an outsider: to one

<sup>1</sup> Vide Liddon's University Sermon, 'The Divine Victim.'

'who was deeply interested in what was happening, feeling that his own religious opinions were being formed on principles which these writers advocated, but, nevertheless, able to take that unimpassioned view of events which city life naturally encourages. We have, therefore, in what he has written a fair and faithful statement concerning the great religious movement of our time, from a lay point of view, by an earnest commercial man, who took a delight in reading whatever was written on either side by influential persons whose words were likely to carry weight.'

It is not often that, on such a subject as that treated of in these lectures, we can obtain an accurate insight into the opinions and feelings of the great body of religious people who are outside the circle of literary effort. The comparatively few members of this class who write for public journals naturally take their tone, to a considerable extent, from the papers to which they contribute, so that their writings lack that weight which is accorded to a writer in a more independent position; whilst the great majority are too much engrossed by their business avocations during the day to devote much time to reading at night, and still less are they disposed to undertake more writing after sitting over the desk for many a weary hour. Mr. Worley seems to have conquered this natural tendency, and in his desire to benefit the Sunday-school teachers with whom he was brought into contact by being himself a Sunday-school teacher, he undertook the preparation of these lectures. He tells us in his Preface that they 'were delivered at Clapham during last Lent to a number of teachers and others interested in the subject. They are reproduced for the sake of those who heard them, and wished to see them in a permanent form, as well as for any others who may think them useful in teaching, or sufficiently interesting for their own perusal.'

It may be well to make an extract from the first Lecture, for the double purpose of showing the point of view from which the lecturer regards his subject, and also as an example of the style in which he writes:

'The Georgian era has been called the *siesta* of the English Church. It was a period of indifference and apathy as far as religion is concerned; but now and again the darkness was relieved by an electric flash, as it were, from the skies. In 1726 William Law (a Nonjuror) published his *Serious Call to a Devout and Holy Life*, a book to which Dr. Johnson tells us he owed his first religious impressions. Somewhat later we have the rising of that great star on the horizon, John Wesley. It is worth noticing that his first serious thoughts were also attributed to Law's work, together with Bishop Taylor's *Holy Living*. Christianity in this country owes very much to the revival effected by the Wesleys, Whitfield, and other like-minded preachers. Their appeals, however, were rather directed to the emotions than to the intellect. They endeavoured to convert the individual soul—a very necessary work, but obviously elementary. The building up of the individual in the faith, as well as the holding together of numbers of people, requires this elementary work to be supplemented by a system, by regular teaching and regular practices, such as the Church provides, but which were very much in abeyance in those days, and whose want the revivalists themselves did not live long enough to realize. We thus see that three forces were in operation to the detriment of the Church of England, viz.—

- (1) The Erastianism of the dominant party among the clergy ;
- (2) The engrossing nature of political and national subjects, which excluded ecclesiastical matters from the public mind, or at least obscured them ; and
- (3) The predominance of emotional over dogmatic and intellectual teaching' (pp. 6, 7).

The subject thus sketched out is then carefully and thoughtfully elaborated, and we can confidently recommend the book to those for whose benefit it is specially intended.

*A Service of Angels.* By Rev. HENRY LATHAM, M.A., Master of Trinity Hall, Cambridge ; Author of *Pastor Pastorum*, &c. (Cambridge : Deighton, Bell, and Co., 1894.)

ORIGINALITY of treatment and freshness of style make Mr. Latham's *Service of Angels* a delightful book. From the bright beginning of the first chapter, where we are told how the 'radiant' 'happiness' of 'a lizard lying in the sunniest nook of the broken coping of the wall' on 'one of the three rocky ridges on which the city' of Siena 'is built' (pp. 1-2) set the author thinking, to the 'parley' between the 'Blessed Angels' and the 'outlying company' 'who had somewhat fallen from their first estate, and had become isolated from the Host of Heaven' (pp. 194-204), with which the 'apologue' ends, a reader's difficulty is, not to maintain his interest, but to lay the book down. Yet, while the composition betokens that the mere writing was a labour of love, there are not wanting signs of the most serious purpose.

The delight of the angels in the sheer beauty of the natural world, their joy in the pleasure as well as in the holiness of men, their office as spirits who minister to God and to mankind, are among the subjects upon which fruitful ideas are gathered from Holy Scripture and human thought with an insight that is singularly keen.

To make life brighter is sometimes to make it better, and to add to the motives for goodness that may be practically felt is to give no small help to many who struggle. The truths contained in *A Service of Angels* may do both. One quotation, as an instance of many passages, will show what we mean.

'One kind of action which is of wide operation is, I think, the sense of company which the belief in angels' presence brings. This frees us from loneliness of soul ; it takes the selfishness out of our joys, and the corrosive poison out of our griefs. A trouble that is nursed in secret embitters a man's disposition and deadens his energy ; but as soon as the fresh air gets at it, and it is shared among sympathizing friends, its ill qualities are done away.

'Those who know the poor will understand best what a comfort this sense of "company" will be to them. They will welcome the angels, with whom, indeed, they have never quite lost touch ; they will rejoice in the notion of their being about them when they are all alone. Hand-workers suffer more from loneliness than head-workers do. The wife watching in her cottage for her husband's coming home ; the handicraftsman all by himself, doing some work which does not engage his mind ; the labourer who has a lonely job in an outlying field and a long

solitary walk home ; all these will find it a blessing to have their minds peopled with heavenly beings who love them, who are not above taking interest in what interests them, and, what is most of all, who are grieved about them when they suffer or when they go wrong. This sympathy in suffering is the keystone of the whole.

'A poor man's life will become quite another thing when he brings the angels into it. Suppose that on his way to work he passes a child in trouble, and setting it right as well as he can, he brightens it up by a smile and a reassuring tone ; or that as he comes home in the evening he goes a little out of his way to help an old woman, laden with a heavy fagot, over a stile. Even little things like this, he may be told, go to swell the joy in Heaven—joy that lasts for ever. Through his doing, something pleasant to recall, which will never pass away, will be stored for ever in angels' minds in Heaven. Here is a new thought and a great one for him to carry home.

'There are urchins in London by scores, hungry and sorely tempted to steal, but struggling against their temptations with a courage and endurance that God and the angels only know. Great is the angels' delight when the child turns victorious away from the treasure exposed on the stall ; great is their sympathy with the hardships which fall to his lot ; they whisper to those who can help him ; they suggest ways in which help may be given, and their suggestions fall on good ground now and then. Surely we might venture to tell a child, "Angels were looking on as you stood with hungry gaze before that open stall, and they brightened with gladness as you turned away."

'But angels are more than passive beholders, and it is as active agents that they will be most recognized by the poor. They may be employed in endless ways of which we can form no idea, but we have Scripture warrant for supposing that they call things to remembrance (St. Luke xxiv. 6, 7), and it is not going much farther to suppose that they put thoughts into people's minds. We cannot be wrong in telling a man, that an inward prompting to right may be the whisper of an angel of God' (pp. 160-3).

It must not be supposed that this book will suggest no thoughts except those about the angels. There is much that is helpful about our Lord's teaching, as in the treatment of His words on the giving of tribute (pp. 47-50), and on other subjects, as in what is said on 'the conditions of life in ideal old age' (pp. 64-70).

To dwell on points of difference in a book which 'is not a purely theological work,' which is intended to be 'easy reading' and to make 'notions' on 'the subject of angel ministry,' 'of late years fallen out of notice,' 'familiar' (Preface, p. v), would be an ungracious task. And if here and there we have met with statements<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Thoughtful Churchmen will hesitate before accepting the assertion that 'angels must possess a spiritual body' (p. 56), the suggestion of 'possible evil and deterioration among the angels' (Preface, p. x.), the ideas apparently implied about those who had 'fallen from their first estate' (p. 194), part of the treatment of the 'union' of Christ 'with the Father' and His Presence 'with us' in 'His Church' (p. 26), some of the limitations on the work of the angels (pp. 21, 96-106), and the separation of the teaching of the Books of Job and Daniel from that of the other canonical writings (pp. 34, 209-10). And we hope no reader will be led by the reference to 'Mr. Mozley's great work on *The Word*' (p. 129) to suppose that that accomplished and brilliant writer

which have interrupted, for the moment, the real pleasure which *A Service of Angels* has given us, we may well hope that these will not seriously interfere with the useful work it is likely to do.

*The Virgin Birth of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Foundation of the Christian Religion.* By the Rev. RICHARD MEUX BENSON, M.A., Student of Christ Church, Oxford, England; Mission Priest of St. John, Bowdoin Street, Boston. Reprint from *Church Eclectic*. (Boston: Damrell and Upham, no date.)

FATHER BENSON well says that the 'truth' of 'the Virgin Birth of our Lord Jesus Christ' is 'the foundation of the whole Christian faith' and 'the essential preliminary of all the body of truth which has to follow' (pp. 1-2). The denial of it is not only incompatible with the retention of any belief in the trustworthiness of Holy Scripture or the unanimous tradition of the Church; it would prove fatal to the dogma of the single Personality of our Redeemer, to the value of the Atonement, and eventually to the doctrine of the Deity of Christ.

We have from time to time met with the statement that, though it is true that our Lord was born of a Virgin, no vital truth would necessarily be impaired if such a belief were abandoned. And, occasionally, among those who are willing to admit that the Resurrection actually happened, and who continue to assert their belief in the Godhead of Christ, we have known His Birth from a Virgin to be questioned or denied.

The necessity of the truth as an essential part of the Christian religion and the points of view to which we have just referred afford sufficient justification for writings to explain and defend it. These may be of different kinds and for different classes of readers. Father Benson's treatise is for believers. The arguments are not such as will ordinarily appeal to those who have not learnt to regard Holy Scripture as a unique revelation, pervaded with a Divine purpose, and therefore full of such spiritual meanings as the Fathers loved to trace in it and the New Testament writers found in the Old Testament. They demand, if they are to be fully appreciated, some recognition of the value of Christian philosophy. They will be of use, therefore (except so far as the Providence of God may, as frequently happens, successfully employ human work just where it would naturally seem to be least serviceable) chiefly in leading those who believe the truth to realize its value better.

Father Benson shows how the fact of our Lord's Birth from a Virgin is bound up with Christianity.

'Occasionally one may read in modern literature the suggestion that no one could vouch for this truth, no one but the Blessed Virgin herself could be its guarantee. On the contrary, the whole of Christianity vouches for the truth of this article. It needs no human authority. Take it away and the Divine life of Christianity is gone. The triumph of Christianity could not be what it is if Jesus Christ were the child of a

was a safe theological guide. The list of *errata* needs to be enlarged by the correction of the misspelling of two names on pp. 218-19.

human father. Its Divine power involves the Divine Person of its founder and the Divine Personality of the child excludes the possibility of any human agent co-operating in the Birth' (p. 2).

He traces the growth of the Messianic belief among the Jews, and points out how at last it centres in one who was to be born of a Virgin by the operation of the Holy Ghost. Wisely setting aside any argument which might be based on the admissions by 'modern science' of 'various instances of parthenogenesis in the order of nature,' he asserts 'the Virgin Birth of Christ as the foundation of our Christianity, *because* it is unexampled, because it is supernatural, because it is Divine' (p. 8). In passages of high spiritual power, of which we can only give two instances, he explains some of the consequences which follow from the truth which is thus declared.

'Jesus Christ came to earth but is not of the earth. The earthly nature is but the robe wherewith He clothes Himself. He clothes Himself with that which was dead, but He is the Lord of life and He makes His vesture live with His own life by assuming it. He clothes Himself with shame, but He is the Lord of Glory and His Glory shines forth through that which clothes Him and makes it resplendent with the indwelling life of God. If He clothes Himself with glorious apparel (Ps. xciii. 1), His clothing is not, as that of fallen Adam, needful to hide His shame. He makes His very clothing to be glorious as the means whereby His own essential glory may be made manifest to His creatures. He clothes Himself with human nature. Yea! He clothes Himself with countless multitudes of saints gathered from amongst men into vital union with Himself. His train, the saintly robe of a regenerate humanity, living because assumed into fellowship with Himself, fills the Temple of God (Is. vi. 1). It is the seamless robe, woven from the top throughout (John xix. 23), which from beneath the sacerdotal glory of His heavenly kingdom, as symbolized by the holy unction of Aaron's beard (Ps. cxxxiii. 2), spreads itself over His Deified humanity,<sup>1</sup> an embroidery of life. Its silken threads, though taken from the worms of earth, live on for ever by His Deific immanence in the power of the Holy Ghost.

'All His Saints are His children in the new life, as they are also His brethren in the relationship of earth. He is "Father of the world to come" (Is. ix. 6). The Church is the second Eve, taken from His own Body, the Mother of us all (Gal. iv. 26; 2 Cor. xi. 2); espoused to Him not by carnal delight, but by spiritual power, so that in her increase He rejoices to find Himself perpetuated in the continuous multitudes of supernatural offspring. They who receive His fulness are they who are reborn of His mystical Body in His spotless Bride the Church in her virginal purity "not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God" (John i. 13).

'He is thus the second Adam. "He is come that we might have life." From Him the race of man derives a life which it had not before. "As in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive" (1 Cor. xv. 22). All the members of Adam share the death under which his body fell by sin. All who are incorporated into the second Adam share the life wherewith His Humanity is glorified. The transmission of death was by a process of natural corruption. The transmission of life is by sacraments of spiritual power. The life which He initiated was not an idea

<sup>1</sup> This phrase is unquestionably used by Father Benson in a wholly orthodox sense. It is one which we never like.



which He outlined but a reality which He communicated. How then should He make man live? He could not communicate the supernatural life if He had not assumed our nature by a supernatural power. He is Himself the Life, and those who do not come to Him cannot have life. They must be supernaturally taken into that manhood which He supernaturally assumed. "This is the record" which His Church has to bear throughout successive generations. "God has given us life, and this life is in His Son" (1 John v. 11) (pp. 21-2).

Our other instance is from the last section of the book.

'National character does not mean development of human personality by endowments over and above what would be possessed by those of other nations. No one can become more than man by any national development. Each national development is rather the loss of some general power, the shrinking up of the nation within the limits of an imperfect manhood, by which means some idiosyncrasy is brought into prominence, whereas it would have been held in check by a more complete development of the whole human character. Nations may be superior one to another in proportion as the elements which one of them loses may be of less value than those which another loses. Whoever loses least remains supreme. . . . Had it not been for the wound of original sin, whereby the unifying life of God was lost, mankind would have remained in absolute unity. We may conceive that the developments of nations and individuals would have multiplied and specialized the common consciousness of joyous power, for whatever was the gain of any one would have been the possession and the delight of all. All the antagonisms of interest, nationality, and every other distinction, would have been avoided. Mankind would have spoken one language, being indwelt by the Word of God. Mankind would have been bound together in one Spirit of Love. . . . One in heart, one in speech, one in act—a multitude of individual relationships, but an absolute unity of consciousness—the human race would have anticipated that unity which is to be accomplished hereafter in the glorified life of the Church as the Body of Christ. . . . The unity was broken up into individualities, and none can be restored until the Bride of Christ formed by the Blood of the Second Adam shed from His Holy Side has gathered the faithful in the full power of His own Resurrection. . . . The corrupt blood multiplied from Adam had to be gathered up into the unity of the Blood of the Immaculate Lamb of God. The multitudes individually broken off from one another by natural birth had to be consolidated in the spiritual unity of Christ's Body by a supernatural birth. Thus it is that now we are "elect through sanctification of the Spirit unto obedience and sprinkling of the Blood of Jesus Christ" (1 Pet. i. 2). . . . Although therefore our Lord was born amidst the relationships of earth in His life of humiliation, He took upon Himself the common humanity of all nations. There was nothing in Him to limit His character, or His affections, or His interests. . . . He is the Seed of the collective humanity, the Seed of the Woman, in the Virgin power of humanity untainted by any individualizing corruption of personal parentage, conceived by the Holy Ghost of the most pure elements of human blood in the womb of the Blessed Virgin, the Mother of God. . . . As . . . He has . . . within Himself the Humanity from which all the nations of the earth have been derived, so must He gather unto Himself a Church from amongst all nations of the world. . . . Christ's Virgin Birth makes His Humanity Catholic in power. There is nothing in any race of man which He does not share as the Son of Man. His Virgin Birth makes His Humanity

VOL. XL.—NO. LXXIX.

R

no less Catholic in its demand. It cannot be satisfied until it has absorbed into<sup>1</sup> itself every element of human nature wherever it may be found. . . . The most savage and degraded nations have some element of human nature which makes them what they are. They are not only capable of being restored in Christ, but their restoration is essential to the integrity of Christ's glorified Humanity, because the virginal Humanity which He has assumed comprises all those elements which have been derived from the original humanity of Adam, our common father. . . . The Church of Christ is . . . a Divine organism, being formed out of all the nations of the world. . . . There was a great African Christianity all along the coasts of the Mediterranean. There was a vast Asiatic Christianity. We ourselves have lived in the age of a great European Christianity. The Church of Christ, as the mystical representation and instrument of His ascended Humanity, must fuse with the spiritual power of His all-comprehensive essence all those manifold nationalities which are being poured in such strange confusion upon the American Continent. We must look for the dark races of Africa to shine with the glory of the Divine countenance. India must wake from her dreams to worship the Personality of the Incarnate God. China must go forward to the hope of Heaven, and the Hermit Kingdom seek a home in the Communion of Saints. . . . It is . . . in virtue of the Virgin Birth that Christ is fitted to be Head over all things to the Church gathered out of all nations of the world' (pp. 35-9).

We doubt the advisability of the inclusion in this work of the sections on the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin and the Scotist theory of the Incarnation. Without accepting the unauthorized doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, we may say that we are not clear as to the soundness of the argument that a child conceived in the ordinary course of nature would of absolute necessity inherit original sin. We have always thought St. Bernard's famous letter<sup>2</sup> more valuable as a witness to the absence of any tradition in favour of the doctrine than because of the arguments he uses against it. And the whole *a priori* question as to the abstract possibility of Divine grace interrupting in the very moment of the conception of a child ordinarily begotten the descent of original sin and of the Eternal Word taking Manhood from one whose human nature had inherited the taint seems to us beyond the limits of our present knowledge and capacity. And, whatever may be the truth of our opinion that Father Benson does not allow sufficient weight to some Scriptural reasons for rejecting the Scotist theory of the Incarnation and to the possibility of an argument he uses on p. 26 being developed so as to assert the necessity of God taking the nature of angels, we cannot doubt that his position would be a stronger one if it was unencumbered by the acceptance of this view.

It is pleasant to put such criticisms aside and thank the author of this little treatise that he has added in it his valuable support of a vital truth to his many and great services to the Church of God.

<sup>1</sup> 'United with' would, perhaps, have expressed the meaning which is evidently intended more accurately than 'absorbed into.'

<sup>2</sup> St. Bernard, *Ep.* clxiv.

*The Psalter, with a Concordance and other Auxiliary Matter.* (London : John Murray, 1895.)

WE have received a charmingly bound copy of this little volume, which bears Mr. Gladstone's name on the cover and at the end of the preface. Its 'purpose,' we are told,

'is to promote the special and separate use of the Psalter, as a book of private devotion';

and it is added that the Psalter is

'the only book of private devotion at our command which we are authorized directly to associate with Divine Inspiration' (Preface, p. iii).

The volume contains the text of the Psalms from the version in the Book of Common Prayer, a set of 'headings for the several Psalms' descriptive of their contents, a list of 'subjects specially touched' in the Psalms, thirty-one extracts 'specially applicable for separate use,' a list of Psalms 'specially appropriated' for particular days or occasions, a selection of 'alternative renderings,' and a concordance which includes both 'proper names' and 'ordinary words.'

Such a work from such a source can only meet with a respectful and sympathetic welcome from earnest Churchmen. The publication of it must be regarded as the veteran statesman letting us see some of the inward power of his own life.

As critics, then, we can do little more than point out the utility of the list of 'headings' and the collection of 'subjects,' express our regret that the 'alternative renderings' are not more fully dealt with, and mention that where we have tested the concordance we have found it accurate and complete.

It remains to quote Mr Gladstone's testimony, which this volume shows to be the testimony of experience, to the theological and devotional value of the Psalms.

'Composed at a stage of the great Revelation earlier and less matured than that under which we live, and therefore presenting to us on particular subjects chequered and imperfect lights,' [the Psalter] 'nevertheless remains to this day the first among all the records of the human soul to Godward, and presents to us in and by itself, all things taken together, a conclusive proof that the Almighty Maker found for Himself a very special way of dealing with chosen souls that He had made, and sealed and stamped it for use throughout all coming time. Nay, there are many of its single verses on which, taken severally, we might be content, so lofty is their nature, to stake the whole argument for a Divine Revelation. Not the least remarkable among its many special features is this, that the highest known treasure-house of individual and personal devotion should also have supplied such material throughout for the public worship of Israel' (Preface, p. iii).

*Chaucer's Canterbury Tales.* Edited, with Notes and Introduction, by ALFRED W. POLLARD. Vols. I. II. (London : Macmillan and Co., 1894.)

THIS is an admirable edition of the *Canterbury Tales* for those who wish to read Chaucer for the enjoyment of his poetry rather than for minute study of the English language. The aim of the editor has

been to produce a trustworthy text, with just enough of notes and interpretations to make the meaning clear, and to indicate the principal sources from which the poet has borrowed his material. What Mr. Pollard has written in his Introduction, (1) in justification of his foot notes and (2) in reference to attempts to produce uniformity of spelling in Chaucer's writings, will meet with general approval.

(1) 'To interrupt one's enjoyment of poetry by looking up words in a glossary appears to me an intolerable penance, and I have therefore put explanations of the obsolete words in foot notes to the pages where they first occur' (p. x).

(2) 'If it could be done, I would gladly myself see his works printed, as Shakespeare's are printed, in modern spelling; because I feel strongly that, at least for the present generation, if Chaucer is to win the popularity which is his due, it must be by his being read as any other poet is read, and not as a text-book for students of Middle English' (p. xiii).

Accordingly the short notes at the foot of the page, and the full glossary at the end of the second volume, are sufficient to explain any difficulty, while the text is printed according to the Ellesmere MS. as the best authority. The few variations of reading occupy very little space, and the spelling is preserved without any attempt to modernize it.

The origin of the present issue was a projected edition by Dr. Furnivall and Mr. A. W. Pollard, which was abandoned because the former could not give the requisite time to the work, and the latter gave way to the proposed large edition of Professor Skeat, and was content to publish in a more modest form the results of his own studies in the Chaucer literature. The *Canterbury Tales* is an instalment of a complete edition of the poet's works 'for a less stalwart class of readers' (p. vii); hence the absence from the glossary and the notes of all etymological matter and of any remarks upon the forms of English words. This is intelligible enough; but it is surely not sufficient, even for this class of readers, to sum up Chaucer's life 'in seventy words,' and say that it is all that one needs to know 'as far as it helps us to understand his works' (p. v). The ordinary reader, not merely the student, wishes to know something of the details of the author's life, in order to realize the age and circumstances of his poetry; and it is disappointing to be referred to another book, a *Primer of Chaucer*, by the same writer (Macmillans, 1893), for what are called 'these beggarly elements of Chaucer-criticism' (p. v). Mr. Pollard has been compelled to break his own rule in the latter part of the Introduction (pp. xviii-xxvii), and he might so easily have transferred, perhaps in a slightly condensed form, the contents of chapters i., iii., and vi. of the *Primer*. If he had done so, the ordinary reader would have understood better the many casual allusions in the *Tales* to the poet's own history, the general sources of his information, and, above all, why the *Tales* are arranged as they are, since the order of the manuscripts is different, and how the pilgrimage to Canterbury was planned and accomplished day by day. As it is, the reader must have the *Primer*, or some other handbook, by his side, or else not fully grasp the idea of the

*Canterbury Tales.* We hope that this defect may be remedied in the next instalment of this edition of Chaucer's works. It is needless to say that both the printing and the paper of these volumes are excellent. Perhaps some readers will object to the black lines and the dots in the margin, which indicate imitation of and translation from other authors, French, Italian, or Latin. These sources are, no doubt, an interesting study, but what has been said in the Introduction (pp. xiv-xxi) and the foot notes would suffice without an artificial arrangement which distracts the eye from the poetry itself.

*Monism as connecting Religion and Science; the Confession of Faith of a Man of Science.* By ERNST HAECKEL. Translated from the German by J. GILCHRIST, M.A., B.Sc., Ph.D. (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1894.)

THE aim of this book is the aim of all philosophy, viz. to discover the unity which is the substratum of all phenomena. The solution which Professor Haeckel offers of this problem of problems is a special form of materialism. He himself, indeed, repudiates the term, inasmuch as he identifies matter and spirit (p. 58); but, seeing that he regards mind as a function of the modified protoplasmic cell, his theory will be rightly described in the ordinary nomenclature of philosophy as materialistic. Matter, he holds, is eternal and self-existent; matter has, through countless ages, evolved itself into the myriad various forms which make up our universe. Before dealing with the details of his theory it is natural to inquire whether, as a matter of fact, it does furnish a Monistic view of the world—whether the book realizes the promise of its title; and we find, somewhat to our surprise, that it does not. We are left with a view which seems as dualistic as any of the theories that he opposes; only the old antinomy of God and the world, the Creator and the created, appears in a new dress as the opposition of the 'cosmic ether' and 'ponderable matter.' He does not, indeed, leave us without the hope that a bridge may be found to connect these two terms, but he admits that at present they remain for us distinct entities (pp. 29-30). To our thinking, when, with Haeckel, we have got rid of Personality in God and man, when we have recognized Soul as a function of a specialized 'ganglion cell,' and have seen in the cosmic ether the 'creating divinity' (p. 25), the old difficulties of a dualistic theory remain in all their force.

The least satisfactory part of the book is the representation of the Christian doctrine of the Personality of God (pp. 69-79). We assert that God is *personal*, because we must interpret Him by the highest category of human thought, which is Personality. We do not assert that God is not immeasurably more than what we mean by 'a person.' This other side of the truth is guarded by denying to Him limitation, which is a necessary ingredient of our idea of Personality. *God is an Infinite Person*, which is a contradiction in terms. So the highest truth here, like the ultimate results of all departments of our knowledge, is presented to us under the form of a final antinomy. God is *personal* and yet God is *infinite*. The old crux, What was God doing

before Creation? (p. 70), is met, at least in part, by the Christian doctrine of the Trinity in Unity. To believe in the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit is to believe that from all eternity there was a Life infinitely rich in all that makes life desirable, in thought and love and will.

We must raise an indignant protest against the charge of materialism brought against the Christian doctrine of the Resurrection of the body (note 17 on p. 112). At least Professor Haeckel might have gone to the original sources and have taken the trouble to read 1 Corinth. xv. 50. The best feature of the book, and that with which we can most cordially sympathize, is the passionate desire to discover the underlying unity of the world, the unity which all thought necessarily postulates, and which it is the unceasing endeavour of philosophy to reach. Professor Haeckel's attack on Christianity as essentially dualistic is beside the mark; for Christianity is alone truly Monistic in that it holds all nature to be the progressive self-revelation of the Divine Logos, a self-revelation which culminates in the Incarnation and its extension through the Church. We prefer the Monism of St. John or of St. Paul to that of Professor Haeckel, as it is set forth in the words, *ὃ γέγονεν ἐν Αὐτῷ ζῶν ἦν* (St. John i. 4), or *ἐξ Αὐτοῦ καὶ δι' Αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς Αὐτὸν τὰ πάντα* (Rom. xi. 35). In a word, this book, in spite of many admirable features, may be truly described as an attempt at a premature synthesis of the final antinomy, God immanent in the world and yet transcendent. We, with our present powers, must leave the two terms unreconciled, believing at the same time that the reconciliation does exist in the Divine Mind, and holding firmly to both sides of the truth.

*Religion in Common Life; or, Topics of the Day regarded from a Christian Standpoint.* Being a Course of Sermons delivered at St. Martin-in-the-Fields, London, by various Preachers. (London: Eliot Stock, 1894.)

THE preface to this volume tells us that

'this course of Sermons was arranged to show in how many ways the influence of religious truth is felt in the performance of the common daily duties of our life; that religion is not either, as some fancy, too much concerned with the next world to be capable of giving a man much practical help or guidance in this; nor, as others say, fit only for women and children, and not calculated to be of much assistance to those who are bearing the burden of the business of the world.'

The sermons have been preached by men of all schools of thought; 'each writer is responsible for his own views alone'; 'no single preacher has heard or seen the sermons preached by the rest,' except Mr. Kitto himself, the vicar of the parish, who has contributed four sermons. The volume certainly lacks unity thereby, but has 'gained in freedom and in variety.' Our impression, after reading all the seventeen sermons, is that a great many things have been said which ought to be said to a London congregation, and have been said well. Perhaps a little more theological teaching would have been desirable. We feel this particularly in the second sermon, upon the



words 'God with us,' where there is no mention of the Immanuel, whose Incarnate Person has surely introduced, as nothing else has, the power of religion into everyday life. And we regret that some of the preachers, in their eagerness to deal with certain aspects of their subjects, should have overlooked certain truths of Holy Scripture : e.g. in Sermon V. it is scarcely correct to say that 'any true idea of the individuality of man, of any conception of man as an independent person,' is absent from the mind 'of the Jewish people as surely as in all other nations before the coming of Christ' (p. 34). Does not the provision in Gen. ix. 6, concerning the sanctity of human life, recognize this individuality, as based upon the Divine Image in man? Or, again, why should Archdeacon Sinclair, in his sermon entitled 'Noblesse Oblige,' speak of the kingdom of Christ as recognizing no ranks and titles, and as 'composed wholly of sincere and earnest Christians,' 'wholly of genuine and thorough believers,' and contrast it with 'the visible Churches'? (pp. 59-60.) Is there any Scriptural warrant for this notion of an *invisible Church*? Does not the Gospel regard the kingdom of heaven as a mixed society? And to say that the Apostles 'would have shrunk from being Prince Palatines,' and 'would have been speechless with horror and indignation' if addressed as 'your Beatitude,' &c. (p. 60), is not consistent with what we know of St. John at Ephesus, wearing the *petalon*, like the high priest among the Israelites, and so claiming a special dignity and rank. Besides, does outward dignity preclude humility and goodness? This is not our experience. These blemishes spoil what is otherwise a most useful sermon. It is a defence of aristocracy, and exhibits clearly both the responsibilities and the temptations of the upper classes; and the literary merit of the sermon is enhanced by the admirable quotations, e.g. from F. W. Robertson (p. 62), Burke (p. 63), Lord Crawford's letter to his family (p. 69), and the beautiful lines by Leigh Hunt from Seneca (pp. 70-1). In Sermon VIII. the preacher (Mr. Ford, of Holy Trinity, Bristol) seems to assume that poverty is in itself an evil (pp. 72, 73). We cannot think it so, with the example of our Lord and His Apostles before us. Poverty is not always associated with degradation, vice, and crime, and yet presents a problem in our times which is separate from that of the kind of poverty which Mr. Ford discusses. His sermon touches upon a number of important points, but is singularly defective in suggesting remedies. One of the preachers insists very strongly that the Church owes it as a duty to those whom she baptizes to see that '*legalized temptations*' are removed out of their way (p. 30). This is, no doubt, much to be desired, but the writer seems to imply that there ought to be no temptations for the Christian child. We think that Archdeacon Sinclair has put the case well when he says (p. 61), 'Our Lord did not in the least intend to make the surroundings of the world suitable to the true Christian, so that he might have an easy time and find no temptations;' and he quotes St. John xvii. 15 most appositely.

The sermons which struck us as the most useful were those of Mr. Buckland, Prebendary Wace, and Mr. Knowling; but many of

the others contained things which are most necessary in these times. For example, Mr. Kitto's sermon on 'The Use of Pain and Suffering' gives eight excellent illustrations of 'the province of pain' (pp. 85-9), showing 'that pain is not an unmixed evil; that it has a ministry to serve and lessons to teach.' So Canon Browne, in a very thoughtful sermon on 'Fairness,' rightly points to 'the gross unfairness' dealt out 'towards political opponents' and 'in the world of religious controversy' (pp. 122-3). Archdeacon Farrar's illustration from the Talmud of the four mothers of demons whom King Solomon controls is very striking (pp. 139-40), and his sermon is filled with other illustrations from all sorts of persons, which make it very readable; but it is full of exaggeration, and there is a tendency to run down the Church and exalt Nonconformity, as if the Church, because she does her work unostentatiously, was not as active as those who are outside her. But it is refreshing to find Mr. Buckland pointing out the dangers of the modern craze of athleticism, the brutalizing tendency of football as played in the North of England, the lowering effect upon character in the forced attempts to 'break the record' in every game or exercise. And it is refreshing to have a sermon like that of Dr. Wace, which insists upon the need of a 'moral and spiritual repentance' as the only condition of 'social amelioration' (p. 99). The sermon which is entitled 'Religion and Politics,' and is based on St. Matt. xxii. 21, is full of good points. Such a sentence as this puts the interpretation of that often misapplied text on its lawful footing: 'The question at issue in the great crisis then before them was not one of the extent of their obligation to their earthly ruler, but of their spiritual and moral relation to the God in whose name our Lord came to them, and to our Lord Himself' (p. 93). The force of *ἀπόδοτε*, 'give back,' is often obscured; it means, as Dr. Wace points out, 'pay your debt: 'you have received some things of Cæsar, and you owe him some things in return.' The inquirers had forgotten their 'debt' to God in their eagerness to throw off their obligation to Cæsar (pp. 92-3). It is refreshing, as we have said, to find one who in dealing with social questions puts in the forefront 'repentance towards God and faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ' as the first conditions of political and social reform (p. 98).

Our last quotations must be from Mr. Knowling's admirable sermon upon an aspect of the Holy Communion which is too often forgotten, viz. its social power. He refers to Professor Pfeleiderer's *Gifford Lectures*, 1894, as suggesting the idea, and he works it out with abundant illustration, e.g. the custom in the Church at Rome of having one consecration of the sacred elements for all the congregations (pp. 129-30), the 'Communion friends' in some parts of France (p. 132), and the customs of Jewish households on the Sabbath eve (p. 132). But more than this, the testimony of individuals in our own day, persons of well-known piety, is most valuable, and even the attitude of some who call themselves Agnostics is upon the same side, viz. that the Holy Communion has a marvellous power to bind us not only closer to God but also to our brethren. It is a pity that

this social aspect of the Eucharist, which St. Paul emphasizes,<sup>1</sup> is so much neglected. Mr. Knowling instances Professor James Clerk-Maxwell and Daniel Macmillan, the publisher, as persons to whom the Holy Eucharist was the mainstay of their lives. The latter used to say that it 'always seemed to him to say more than all other services, as to how we are united to each other and to God.'

'Or recall from another page of biography how, amidst a life beset with special temptations, and full of excitement, those "comfortable words," as the Prayer Book calls them, went home to the heart of the gifted English actress, Fanny Kemble; how they enabled her to make her profession "a high calling," and how they strengthened her resolve to remain a constant communicant in the Church of England' (p. 134).

We feel that this sermon is quite the most helpful in the whole series, because it is evident that the preacher could tell us much more that would be helpful upon other aspects of the same Sacrament.

*Hymns and their Stories.* By A. E. C. With a Preface by E. C. S. GIBSON, M.A., Principal of the Theological College, Wells, and Prebendary of Wells Cathedral. Published under the direction of the Tract Committee. (London: S.P.C.K. 1894.)

PREBENDARY GIBSON explains the aim of this modest little work. A. E. C. felt that Dr. Julian's *Dictionary of Hymnology* was designed rather for the student than for the general reader, and that there was room for 'a small work which should popularize the subject, and tell in simple language the story of the growth of Christian hymnody, assigning, as far as possible, to their proper dates and authors those universal favourites which find a place in all the hymn-books in common use' (Pref. p. vii). So many attractive stories about hymns have been accumulated by A. E. C., and so much diligence and care has been shown, that we cannot find fault without regret. And yet we must not say that we are altogether satisfied. Let us see what A. E. C. has done. He (or more probably she) has noticed the hymns of slightly more than two hundred writers, has mentioned the circumstances of the origin of many of them, and has gathered round them many beautiful little pieces of religious history. Moreover, the order in which the materials are arranged is highly instructive. We have a chapter on Bible Hymns which includes the Psalms and the Evangelical canticles, and notices passages in which fragments of early Christian hymns may possibly be detected. This is followed by the Prayer-Book Hymns—the *Te Deum*, the lesser *Gloria*, the *Tersanctus*, the two renderings of the *Veni Creator* in the Ordinal, and such fragments as survive in the Order for the Burial of the Dead. The Greek hymns from the second to the ninth centuries and the Latin hymns from the fourth century onwards come next, and we pass along the subject historically to early English hymns, metrical psalms, carols; German, French, Italian, Scandinavian, and Welsh hymns; and then to later English and American examples, stopping short of the compositions of living authors. We

<sup>1</sup> 1 Corinth. x. 16, 17.

could never refuse to read the detailed account of Bede's death (p. 78), or the noble story of the Uganda martyrs (p. 188); but a collection of the beautiful anecdotes which may be gathered from ecclesiastical history and strung together somewhat loosely by their connexion with hymns or hymn-writers is not all, or nearly all, that is required in a book on hymnology for general readers. These are days when people need to prune their metrical words of praise with increased care, and to have some book of plain and definite instruction to teach them what a hymn really is, and by what standard any composition which professes to be a hymn may be judged. A doctrinal as well as an historical guiding hand is wanted. Some such order of excellence is required as this: (1) Hymns which praise God *propter magnam gloriam*; (2) hymns which praise God for His goodness to us in creation, providence, redemption, sanctification; (3) hymns which contemplate God's love for individual souls, with a view to adoration; (4) hymns which express the soul's need and longing for God; (5) hymns in which the soul describes itself, addresses other souls, turns inwards not only to elevate but also to analyse itself, and so forth. The hymns in this last class are often of a deeply personal character; but they are, strictly speaking, often helps to excite the soul to worship rather than a worthy expression of worship itself, and A. E. C. has not given much help to distinguish between hymns which fall into a high place and those which would occupy a low one in this division. On p. 21 St. Matt. viii. 8 is apparently a misprint, and the fine collection of carols made by the Oxford Professor of Music and the Precentor of Lincoln Minster is referred to on p. 91 as 'S. & S.,' although 'Stainer and Bramley' is correctly given in the footnote.

*Adamnani Vita S. Columbae.* Edited from Dr. Reeves's text, with an Introduction on early Irish Church History, Notes, and a Glossary by J. T. FOWLER, M.A., D.C.L., Fellow of the Society of Antiquaries of London; Lecturer in Hebrew, Librarian, and Vice-Principal of Bishop Hatfield's Hall, in the University of Durham. (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, MDCCCXCIV.)

TEN printed editions of Adamnan's *Life of S. Columba* have previously appeared, although Dr. Reeves was the first, in 1857, to print the *Life* in a separate form. Reeves's edition remains, as Dr. Fowler truly observes (Pref. pp. viii, xi), 'a well-nigh exhaustive, a truly monumental work, which has been of the greatest service to all writers on St. Columba from Montalembert downward.' That noble piece of scholarship, however, is said to be 'scarcely accessible in either of the forms in which it has appeared'—at least, for the use of the junior students in our Universities or elsewhere—and for these Dr. Fowler issues the present edition. It is an edition which is destined, we believe, to stand next to Reeves's great work, and it is a credit to both the Universities which are connected with it—to Durham because its author shows us a specimen of very careful and assiduous work, and to Oxford because the printing and execution of the book are all that can be desired.

The introduction on early Irish Church history (pp. xv-lxxxvii) is too interesting to allow us to agree with Dr. Fowler's modest apology, that it 'has perhaps extended to an undue length' (p. lxxxvi). It is dated 'June 9, 1894,' the anniversary of the day on which Columba died, which in 597 was what we now call Trinity Sunday—one of those coincidences which delight the student of Church history, and which are to be referred to the coincidence of the deaths of St. Cyprian and St. Chrysostom on Holy Cross day as the most memorable sample of their kind. In dealing with Ireland Dr. Fowler reminds us that we are standing outside the area of the great Roman Empire, in a country where an ancient clan system, and a threefold order of druids, bards, and brehons, moulded Church organization—at least to some extent. We pass from this to the life of St. Patrick, the three orders of Irish Saints, and the characteristics of Irish monasticism as a preparation for the proper understanding of the early years of Columba. Before we can be ready for Adamnan's text we have to be conducted to Iona, to see Columba's work as a missionary and a founder in its true light, and to trace the line of his successors up to and including his biographer Adamnan. For this purpose Dr. Fowler proves a most pleasant and well-informed guide, and a clear genealogical table helps us to trace the Abbots of Hy at a glance. A list of 'authorities cited' shows how much ground has been covered for the work, and a page of corrections and additions includes most of the misprints. The notes hit the happy medium between too much and too little, leaning slightly to the side of brevity, which is a good fault. If due allowance is made for the advantage which Dr. Fowler has over Dr. Reeves in following him, there is still in the later editor a margin of new material which justifies his honest pride in saying that, although Dr. Reeves's notes and introductions have furnished much of the information here given, yet by no means the whole of it is derived from that source. Many supplementary details of great interest have been collected by Dr. Fowler. The curious term '*tailcend*,' which plays a part in the tonsure controversy, is said by Dr. Reeves to be rendered by '*Asciciput*,' adzehead, in the 'Book of Armagh.' But Dr. Fowler brings a reading, '*Lasciciput*,' from Dr. Todd, who connects it with '*lixivium*,' barber's soap. (Intro. p. xlii.) Several interesting references are added in a note on lib. ii. c. 3 to the quotations of Reeves *in loc.* on the wattled buildings of the Celtic Church, and again in lib. ii. c. 42 to Reeves's references to passages on the coracle; while, of course, Dr. Fowler does not fail to describe the fine example of the *dolata longæ naves* found at Brigg in Lincolnshire in April 1886 (p. 121). He adds a reference to St. Patrick to Reeves's list of examples in Irish hagiology of the subjection of the body to extreme cold, and gives an instance from a couplet under a painting at Carlisle Cathedral, and another from the Life of St. Godric (p. 146). But he does not refer to the case of Drythelm,<sup>1</sup> although allusions to Bede in the notes are frequent and interesting, not only to the

<sup>1</sup> Bede, v. 12.

*Historia gentis Anglorum*, but also to the *Vita S. Cuthberti* and the *Historia Abbatum*. It is perhaps because Dr. Fowler's notes are so suggestive that we are inclined to think that additions might have been advantageously made to them in some places. Thus, in a note on the custom of the Wednesday and Friday fast (p. 37), it would have been better to go further back than St. Augustine, and to quote Tertullian.<sup>1</sup> The intercourse between Gaul and Britain and Ireland, mentioned on p. 39, n. 3, might be copiously illustrated, although Dr. Fowler confines himself to one reference. In the note on the tame crane that followed St. Columba into church (p. 151) we are sorry that a little collection of similar stories was not made. The obedience of brute animals to the word of the Christian preachers is a favourite incident in such early works as the *Acts of SS. Paul and Thecla*,<sup>2</sup> for 'he who is joined to God with a pure spirit finds all things uniting themselves to him in God.'<sup>3</sup> We should not have exclaimed against padding if Dr. Fowler had given us St. Cuthbert and his eider ducks, St. Guthlac and his swallows, St. Hugh and his swan.<sup>4</sup>

There is no authority that we know of for saying that the 'albus caballus' mentioned by Adamnan in iii. 23 was an old white horse, as is assumed by Dr. Fowler in his introduction (p. lxxiv), in his index, and in the marginal note on p. 156. It is a slight error which has escaped the notice of another historian,<sup>5</sup> but not of the Bishop of Edinburgh.<sup>6</sup> The note on the text, '*Inquirentes autem Dominum non deficient omni bono*,' on p. 157, notices that the Vulgate reads *minuentur*, but does not say that *deficient* is the reading of the old Italic version. In arranging his materials under the heads of glossary, index, notes, and corrections and additions, Dr. Fowler has sometimes repeated his information and sometimes left matters incomplete, so that we have to supplement the materials in one place by those from another. Thus, both in the glossary and in the corrigenda we are told that *tiaga* is the plural of *tiag*, and that we are to read *tiag* in the

<sup>1</sup> *On Prayer*, § 19; *On Fasting*, §§ 10, 14. Note also the *Shepherd of Hermas*, iii. 5.

<sup>2</sup> Salmon's *Introduction to New Testament*, p. 419 (ed. 1).

<sup>3</sup> Felix of Jarrow, *Life of St. Guthlac*, § 25.

<sup>4</sup> See Job v. 23; Psalm l. 10, 11. The Dean of Chichester collects allusions in the writings of St. Chrysostom (*Life of St. John Chrysostom*, p. 163). For a beautiful account of St. Godric, to whom Dr. Fowler alludes on p. 146, who 'feared the hissing of a viper no more than the crowing of a cock,' and who said, 'He who denies himself the converse of men wins the converse of birds and beasts and the company of angels' (see *England under the Angevin Kings*, i. 77-79). On St. Francis Assisi see Mrs. Oliphant's *Life* (pp. 119, 250), and cf. *Church Quarterly Review* for July 1888 (p. 347). Kingsley's love of creatures, especially of birds, is mentioned in his *Life* (ii. 9). Compare Goldwin Smith's *Life of Cowper* (p. 48) and Sir E. Arnold's *The Light of Asia* (p. 111). Dean Gregory tells us that 'it was no uncommon thing to see the St. Paul's pigeons on Dr. Liddon's shoulder or pecking out of his hand' (*Church Monthly* for May 1892, p. 100).

<sup>5</sup> Bright, *Early English Church History*, p. 279, n. 4.

<sup>6</sup> *The Celtic Church in Scotland*, p. 115, n.



note on p. 78. The list of Grecisms under 'Græcismi' in the glossary is incomplete, for it omits 'xenium,' which is given *sub loc.* as occurring on pp. 53 *n.*, 63. The index enables us to collect the various items of information on one subject from different parts of the book, but a reader who wants to see what Dr. Fowler has to say upon the typography and the name of Iona will think that he has to turn up scattered references which might have been all put into one place with advantage. And, after all, Dr. Fowler only indirectly notices that Y is pronounced *ee* by saying that 'Ee-choluim-cille' is at present the recognized vernacular' (p. lxi). The same amount of hunting is necessary for the full illustration of the word 'coracle.' The notes would have been much improved if the information had been massed in a note on a single passage, and merely cross references given in all other places where the subject occurred. We are bound to say, however, that we have hunted about in the notes with very great pleasure, for we were continually coming upon some instance of Dr. Fowler's diligence and accurate judgment. Thus he infers that Bede did not know either Cummian's Life or Adamnan's from the cautious 'feruntur,' so characteristic of Bede, in *Hist. Ecc.* ii. 4. And his estimate of Dr. Smith's *Life of S. Columba* (Edinb. 1798)—that it 'is not of much value' (p. xi)—is confirmed by a quotation on p. 140. A list of Scripture texts is given, and we think that Dr. Fowler must be said to have left no stone unturned to produce a fully annotated edition of the great biography, even if he has left something to be desired in the arrangement of his materials. To the corrections must be added 175 for 17 on p. xiv.

*A Brief Directory of Elementary Ritual, chiefly Eucharistic.* By the Very Rev. T. I. BALL. With a Preface by the BISHOP OF ARGYLL AND THE ISLES. (London: J. Masters and Co., 1894.)

A GREAT part of this book is filled with most reasonable and common-sense advice, that might have been given by Dom Claude de Vert in the last century, or by Mr. Micklethwaite in this. Some seems so elementary that it is a wonder that it is needed; but then, the Bishop of Argyll and the Provost of Cumbrae have doubtless sufficient knowledge from experience that it is needed. It is insisted upon that everything in the church should be clean, neat, orderly, and tidy; for example, that the cross should be in the *middle* of the altar, the two candlesticks equally distant from its ends, and the candles standing *straight* in their sticks (p. 11). Anything like a fussy ceremonial is to be avoided; the priest is to be in church at least a quarter of an hour before service; the sign of the cross to be made 'with dignified and composed moderation' (p. 15). All this is excellent; and there are many people who will accept warnings given by the Provost of Cumbrae who would not take them from the Monk of Cluny. But though we agree with the Provost in so many of his principles, yet there are instances in detail in which he seems to have taken over modern High Church practices without sufficient examination of their history. The *vetus zyma* has not been sufficiently purged out. If there be one direction plain in the Scottish Office, plainer even than

in the English Office, it is that the bread and wine are to be set on the altar after the alms. Yet the Provost's directions in the text, on p. 24, exactly reverse the rules of the Service-book—an irritating example of private judgment; for such directions are not only unrubrical, but unhistorical. So, too, his directions to leave the linen cloths always on the altar are inconsistent with those which he gives to take away that on the credence. If it be desirable to put out the Eucharistic vestments for each celebration (p. 17), why not the linen cloths on the altar? The modern practice of leaving them on the altar is an infirmity of the sexton, who did not want the trouble of putting out the cloths for each service. Seen abroad by some wandering ecclesiologist, the custom must have been brought home as a 'Catholic practice' without the least knowledge of its history. On the other hand, there is good advice (p. 22) not to let the corporal hang over the front edge of the altar, a practice which has sprung up among us within ten or fifteen years only. But why does the Provost allow a layman to serve the altar without a surplice? A lay server is bad; but unsurpliced, vile. On the whole, the book would have been greatly improved by a little attention to 'antiquarian research,' of which, however, the Provost seems to think but little, though it would have saved him from recommending some modern Roman practices which have sprung merely from idleness, or indeed from poverty, such as the directions that the cruets are to be always of glass. In England, such antiquarian research is absolutely necessary if we are to understand the rubrics, of which the Ornaments Rubric is one of the very first in ceremonial matters; and this neglect of an appeal to history is a blemish upon a book which has good principles and intentions.

*Divine Worship; or, the Ceremonial of the Holy Eucharist, with some Explanation of its Meaning.* (London: J. Masters and Co., no date.)

It is hard to treat a tract like this seriously. It is anonymous, and seems to have been written by someone just ordained, or about to be ordained, as a sort of trying of the pen. While all the old, unhistorical, mystical explanations of ceremonies are given (exploded since the time of Dom Claude de Vert), a number of modern Roman practices are applauded and suggested which a whiff of history would sweep away. The writer might have learnt that everything that is done in the Church of Rome at the present day is not of necessity a 'Catholic custom,' or even approved by the central authorities at Rome; but elementary information on ceremonial has evidently yet to be acquired.

*Official Year-Book of the Church of England.* (London: S.P.C.K., 1895.)

It is with pleasure that we welcome another year's account of the work of the Church in the various provinces of religious, benevolent, and social efforts that she is making for the benefit of the people of England. As we turn over its pages we feel not only that much is

being done, but also that it must have caused great and anxious labour to its able and industrious editor to collect all the information it contains. Each year Mr. Burnside has succeeded in arranging the facts he has collected in a more usable shape, and each year he has succeeded in making more complete the statements of facts with which he deals. Last year he was enabled to tell us that he had received answers to his paper of inquiries from 12,875 incumbents, and that only 687 had to be accounted for; this year the number of defaulters is reduced to 487, whilst that of the incumbents who have replied is increased by 213. This must be very nearly exhaustive, as there must always be many benefices vacant from death and other causes, and also many others where the incumbent has been in charge for too short a time to justify him in giving the important returns for which he is asked. The attempt to disestablish and disendow that portion of the Church of England which is found in Wales has evidently led the editor to take special interest in all that bears upon the present position of the threatened dioceses. This is well and temperately explained in the preface.

'Mindful of the character and work of our great Head—"He shall not strive nor cry, neither shall any man hear His voice in the street"—the Church would instinctively recoil from vain boasting, or from any temptation to rest the authority and claims of her mission upon mere popular demonstrations of success. Now, however, that the Church's enemies threaten to deprive her of that influence which through long ages she has exerted on the national religious life, and to alienate the material resources she has inherited from the piety and devotion of her children through the centuries, and thus to cripple her power and usefulness, it is an urgent and manifest duty to place before the nation the records of her work. These records are presented for thoughtful study, not only to arouse and encourage Churchmen to zeal and faithfulness and to the bold defence of all that should be dearest to them in this great crisis, but also in the fervent hope that others, who are prominent in endeavours to seek the disestablishment and disendowment of the Church, may be led, upon thoughtful and conscientious reflection, to consider whether the spiritual, moral, and social well-being of this great nation would be advanced by a measure which, if successful, would hamper the Church's work.'

After this introduction we turn to what is recorded of the Church work in Wales. If we look first at the tables of statistics for all England at the commencement of the volume, we find that the four Welsh dioceses compare far from unfavourably with the rest of England. If we take all England through we find that the number of baptisms in Church is rather more than seventeen for every thousand of the population, whilst in Wales it is twelve for every thousand; but when we come to the number of communicants it is estimated at 5 per cent. of the population in England and 6½ per cent. in Wales. Board schools in Wales are instructing 152,177 children, whilst Church schools are educating 73,875. When the poverty of many of the rural parts of Wales is taken into account this is a not unsatisfactory proof of the religious earnestness of her people. If we turn to the language census, about which a good deal has been said,

we find that English alone was the language of 719,416 of her people, and Welsh alone of 508,036, whilst there were 402,253 who spoke both languages. During the last ten years 185 churches have been consecrated in Wales, showing that the Church is actively exerting itself, and that an increasing number of people are glad to have her services; and at the same time mission rooms and other buildings scattered about the hill-sides and the poorer portions of the larger towns can accommodate 57,153 worshippers. If we turn from the provision made for work, and the use made of the opportunities within their reach by the people in bringing their children to baptism and themselves being present at the Holy Communion, to the provision made for the support of the clergy, we find that the nett income of the incumbents of 1,081 parishes, arising from tithe rent charge, glebes, pew rents, fees, Easter offerings, interest on funded property, and from the Ecclesiastical Commissioners amounts to 186,046*l.*, or 172*l.* for each incumbent if the amount were equally divided. The sums contributed by Church people for infirmaries, hospitals, &c., contrast favourably with these figures, as during the year they appear to have given for such objects 251,858*l.*, whilst the Nonconformists are credited with only 24,006*l.* Assuming that these figures are correct, and that Church people place the interests of their Church in the first place, they might deprive the sick poor of all the comforts and advantages they now enjoy by transferring what they now contribute to promote their welfare to the support of their own clergy. That a considerable portion of these funds would be so transferred is possible, for benevolent people with limited incomes who now do all they can for the sick poor would be compelled to discontinue a large part, if not the whole, of their charitable contributions to make good the revenues of the Church of which they had been unjustly deprived. Besides benefactions for hospitals Church people contributed during the year 240,643*l.* for the promotion of Church work; a large part of this would have to be otherwise applied if the jealousy and greed of the enemies of the Church should deprive the clergy of the limited incomes they now derive from the liberality of Church people in past generations. These figures have all been taken from the book which we are noticing, which thus sums up what the Church in Wales has done during the last fifty years:

It has doubled the number of its clergy.

It has spent more than three millions in church-building.

It has built or restored 1,228 churches in the 1,080 parishes.

It has spent more than a million in voluntary gifts to National schools.

It has more than doubled the number of children in Church schools in Wales.

It has contributed three-quarters of a million for the building, founding, and maintaining hospitals, infirmaries, and similar institutions.

For anyone who has to speak on this important subject this book would be invaluable.